



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 23, 2013

No. 106

## Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God our Creator and Redeemer, we are accompanied by Your blessings. May these blessings motivate our Senators to rededicate themselves to Your service, striving to keep America strong. Make their hearts reservoirs of love, purity, and honesty. Lord, keep them calm in temper, clear in mind, and sound in heart, as You inspire them to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with You. May the tyranny of partisanship and expediency never bend their conscience to low aims which betray high principles.

We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

### TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 99, which is the Transportation appropriations bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 99, S. 1243, a bill making appropriations for the De-

partments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the time until noon will be equally divided and controlled. At noon there will be a cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 1243. If cloture is invoked, all postcloture time will be yielded back and we will vote on adoption of the motion to proceed. I hope that will be a voice vote and we can begin consideration of the bill immediately following the vote at noon.

The Senate will recess from 12:30 until 2:15 p.m. today for our weekly caucus meetings.

### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

I ask unanimous consent that Senator CHIESA be recognized at 2:15 p.m. today for up to 15 minutes to deliver his maiden speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I am so happy to see the Presiding Officer. The Senator might have presided before but I haven't been able to witness that. So I am very happy to have the Senator here. We are so fortunate to have him here with his wide-ranging experience as a Member of Congress. My time in the House was some of the most pleasant times of my career. I so admire and respect the House of Representatives. And for the Presiding Officer to have spent almost four decades there indicates the people of Massachusetts will have someone here who will immediately hit the ground running, and we are very happy to have the Senator with us. We have the committee the Senator wanted, and with the wide experience he has had in the areas of his choice, he will be a great benefit to Massachusetts and our country.

Today the Senate will begin work on the Transportation, Housing and Urban

Development bill. It is a bipartisan measure that received six Republican votes coming out of the full committee. This legislation will strengthen our economy by investing in roadways, railways, airports, bridges, and more. I applaud the full committee chair BARBARA MIKULSKI for her good work and being so excited about bringing forth the appropriations bills, and long-time member of the Appropriations Committee chairwoman PATTY MURRAY. She is chair of the subcommittee that will be working on that for the next few days. I appreciate their diligence and their bipartisan work on this measure.

The Transportation, Housing appropriations bill has always been a bipartisan bill. As we speak, we have 70,000 bridges in this country in need of major repair. We have bridges in America today where schoolbuses unload their children before going over the bridge. We have bridges that are in need of extensive repair and some that need to be replaced completely. One of every five miles of American roads is not up to safety standards, so it is easy to see why this bipartisan effort to upgrade America's crumbling infrastructure is so important. Our deficient roads, bridges, railways, and runways are a drag on our economy.

But this crisis is also an opportunity—an opportunity—to create jobs by rebuilding America, which needs replenishing, restoring, and rebuilding. This bill will make traveling safer and more efficient for American families and businesses.

We get so upset when we are on roads and freeways that are jammed and we think how inconvenient it is for us. Think how inconvenient it is for one of those trucks that is carrying products to be delivered and sold, how much it is costing each of us in our individual vehicles, and how it is costing us more every minute that truck is stopped in a road because of heavy traffic. It is more expensive than virtually everything we do in America. We have to do

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S5809

a better job on our crumbling infrastructure. This bill will make traveling safer, as I indicated, and more efficient.

The Senate bill also makes crucial investments in affordable housing programs that assist low-income families in need. This legislation is an important step toward eliminating homelessness, especially among America's veterans.

By contrast, the very partisan companion bill from the House that they passed puts affordable housing out of reach for most everyone. Many who are out of reach of getting help are the elderly or disabled.

The House bill also slashes investments on new roads and bridges, and makes deep cuts to the Federal aviation efforts to modernize our air traffic control system. The Senate bill is a bipartisan blueprint, investing in modern infrastructure and creating new jobs while maintaining a vital social safety net. House Republicans obviously have a totally different version. They are jamming things through there on a totally partisan basis.

On Sunday, JOHN BOEHNER, Speaker of the House, said Congress should not be judged by how many bills it passes but by how many laws it repeals. If that is true, House Republicans are failing even by their own measure. They have replaced virtually nothing. So by the Speaker's own admission they are not getting anything passed, and by his own analysis they are getting nothing repealed. So they are doing nothing. We have known that, but it is unusual for the Speaker to acknowledge that on the Sunday shows.

If my Republican colleagues are looking for a law to repeal, I would suggest they take a look at the short-sighted and mean-spirited sequester law. Democrats are happy to help them roll back these arbitrary cuts—these meat axe cuts—which threaten national security as well as the economy.

In the news today, there was a briefing by the Secretary of Defense talking about how senseless the cuts are to the Defense Department. They are done with a meat axe, as I said. So we need to roll back these arbitrary cuts—not only to the military but to all of government.

Unless Democrats and Republicans work out a bipartisan solution that replaces the sequester, crucial investments in everything from early childhood to medical research to military readiness will be in jeopardy. They are already in jeopardy.

It has been 122 days since the Senate passed its budget, but Senate Republicans still refuse to let Democrats, led by Budget Committee chair PATTY MURRAY, negotiate a budget compromise with our House Republican colleagues. Senator MURRAY and others have been to the floor numerous times. We have had Republicans come here to the floor and say how foolish it is not to be able to go to conference. We have not given up on reversing the sequester

and setting sound fiscal policy through regular order in the budget process. We know Democrats and Republicans will never find common ground if we never start negotiating. That is what Senator MURRAY has said many times.

Sequester will cost us investments in education which helps keep America competitive and will cost millions of seniors, children, and needy families the safety net that keeps them from descending into poverty. Because of drastic cuts to the National Institutes of Health, sequester could also cost the country in humankind, in a cure for AIDS, Parkinson's disease, or Alzheimer's.

Congress can stop these devastating cuts to crucial medical research and programs that protect low-income children. All they need to do is work with us. We can't do it alone. We need the Republicans' help. The cost of reducing the deficit with a meat axe today is missing out on the next polio vaccine tomorrow, and the price is simply way too high.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

WELCOMING SENATOR MARKEY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I too want to welcome the new Senator from Massachusetts to the Senate. He will find presiding over the Senate an enlightening experience. And if tradition is followed, he will get to do it a lot.

THE PIVOT

There are many overused expressions here in Washington. Game changer comes to mind. But I think the worst may be the so-called pivot. I say this not just because it is used too much to mean anything, but also because it is a troubling frame of mind.

I mean, the idea that the White House can pivot to jobs for a day or two and then abandon it for a few weeks or months and then pivot back again for a couple of days epitomizes the attitude that turns people off from politics. It is the notion that job creation is somehow more about scoring points at convenient moments than doing what is necessary to get Americans back to work. This is the kind of thing that angers folks in Kentucky and across the country, but it seems to be the only thing this administration and its allies in Congress are ever interested in because here is the thing. Not only should we be focused on jobs day in and day out around here, as Senate Republicans have been all along, but it is also not as though we don't know what is needed to get our economy back on track. It is not as though we don't know how to get the private sector moving again and creating jobs.

We don't need to pivot. We need to do the things that have been staring us in the face for the past 4½ years. If Washington Democrats are serious about turning the economy around, they would be working collaboratively with Republicans to do that instead of sit-

ting on the sidelines and waiting to take cues from the endless political road shows the President puts up whenever he feels like changing a topic.

I mean, there are some pretty obvious things we should be spending our time on around here—things such as implementing a revenue-neutral reform of our Tax Code to make it fairer, flatter, and more conducive to the kind of economic growth that can generate the type of stable middle-class jobs we desperately need, things such as reimagining a regulatory state that was designed in the 20th century so that American companies and workers can remain competitive in the 21st. The regulatory state we have now is entirely geared toward the past, not the present and the future—things such as developing and refining more energy right here at home, instead of importing it from overseas.

But Washington Democrats haven't worked with us to do almost any of that. Instead, they have mostly given us higher taxes, an endless stream of regulations, and an unwillingness to pursue commonsense energy projects that could put more Americans to work right now.

They have given us a stimulus that ballooned the debt, maddeningly complex regulations that failed to solve too big to fail, and made bailouts the official law of the land. And they gave us a 2,700-page health care law that almost no one read, with a tower of at least 20,000 pages of accompanying regulations and redtape that almost no one can understand.

It is no wonder so many Americans remain out of work, with 54 months of unemployment at or above 7.5 percent. In Kentucky, the rate is, regrettably, even higher.

Meanwhile, Washington Democrats have been pivoting back and forth, back and forth. In fact, they pivot so much these days that they often don't seem to know what to do with themselves when there is an actual policy issue to be solved—an issue where you would assume many Republicans and Democrats would normally agree. Take the student loan issue. Right now the unemployment rate for 20- to 24-year-olds is about 13.5 percent.

For teens it is even worse—about 24 percent. The youth of our country are struggling. Yet, with that backdrop, Senate Democrats still continue to fight with each other over the student loan bill 23 days after the deadline they themselves warned us about.

Congressional Republicans and President Obama have actually been more or less on the same page on this issue from the very start. We have agreed on the need to pursue permanent reform for all students, not just a short-term political fix for some of them. Still, Senate Democrats persisted with show votes on a bill that always seemed more about politics than policy—wasting precious time. Then, with the July 1 deadline blowing past, they started bickering among themselves about the

way forward and continue to do so, apparently, even now. They need to stop. Democrats need to finally allow the bipartisan student loan reform proposal to come to a vote this week so we can pass it and ensure there is one less Washington-created problem for young people to worry about in this economy because it is tough enough out there for them already.

The Obama economy has not been kind to the youth of our Nation. I hope the White House and Senate Democrats will help us change that because this persistently high unemployment is simply not acceptable, and neither is pretending it can be changed by simply executing another pivot or delivering another campaign-style speech or just spending more taxpayer money because Washington Democrats have tried all that before, over and over, and, in fact, it is just not working.

I yield the floor.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

Under the previous order, the time until 12 noon will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. McCONNELL. I suggest the absence a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### STUDENT LOANS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise this morning in strong opposition to the legislation which I assume is coming to the floor today which, if passed, would be a disaster for the young people of our country who are looking forward to going to college and for their parents who are helping them pay their bills. Our job is to improve the dismal situation in terms of college affordability and the indebtedness of young people in this country, to improve that situation, to make it better, not to make it worse, and that is exactly what this proposed legislation would do.

I ask for support from my colleagues for an amendment I have filed that would provide a 2-year sunset to this bill, an approach that would prevent student interest rates from soaring and allow us the time, through the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, to deal with this problem through a constructive long-term solution. This issue is too important to be rushed through this body without hearings, without listening to the people who will be affected by this bill—the millions of young people who wish to go to college, who do not want to leave school in deep debt, and their parents as well. We should be listening to

them, not rushing this bill through today.

I thank Senators LEAHY, WHITEHOUSE, GILLIBRAND, and SCHATZ for their cosponsorship of this amendment. I look forward to widespread support from my colleagues.

Let's be honest about something we do not talk about enough; that is, in many ways our government is selling out the young people of our country. When we do that, when we ignore the needs of the young people of our country, in many ways we are selling out the future of the United States of America because the young people are the future.

If we do not turn this around, I fear very much that we will continue on the downward spiral we have seen for the last several decades, a spiral in which the rich get richer, Wall Street and the multinational corporations continue to enjoy recordbreaking profits, while the middle class continues to disappear and poverty remains catastrophically high. If we pass the legislation on the floor today without improving it, we will simply be taking one more step in the wrong direction.

Before I get into the gist of what this legislation is about and what my amendment will do, let me say a few words about where we are today with regard to the young people in our country.

At this moment the United States has, by far, the highest rate of childhood poverty of any major country on Earth—almost 22 percent. In many parts of this country we are seeing a lack of social mobility, where people who are poor, who grow up poor, stay poor. That is not what this country is supposed to be about.

At this moment the childcare situation in this country is beyond disgraceful. Millions of working families are unable to find affordable quality childcare, and many of our young people enter kindergarten and first grade years behind where they should be, both intellectually and emotionally.

At this moment the unemployment rate for high school graduates is close to 20 percent. That is the official rate. The real rate, including those who are working part time and those who have given up looking for work, is actually much higher. If you can believe this—and this is a statistic that should frighten us all; it should make us all ashamed—the official unemployment rate for Black youth age 16 to 19 is 43.6 percent.

I share the concerns many people have recently expressed about the tragic death in Florida of Trayvon Martin. But let's not forget that there are tens of thousands of other young African-American kids all over this country who are worried about where they are going to go with their lives. As the Bureau of Justice Statistics informs us, one out of three African-American men can expect to go to prison during his lifetime. What a horrible waste of human potential.

Our goal must be to see that these young people are ending up in college or in decent jobs—not in jail, not dying from drug overdoses, not involved in petty crime or self-destructive activities. This legislation will simply make it harder for those kids and for all kids to get the higher education they need in order to succeed in life.

Right now, today, hundreds of thousands of young people in this country who have the ability to go to college are looking at the cost of college, the indebtedness they will incur, and they are saying: No, I am not going to go to college.

What does that say about the future of this country?

This legislation, which over a period of years will drive interest rates even higher than they are today, will make it harder for the average kid, the working-class kid to get to college. All of us know we live in a very competitive global economy. If we are going to succeed as a nation in this competitive economy, we need the best educated workforce in the world. Unfortunately, compared to the rest of the world, we are doing virtually nothing to make that happen.

In June the OECD—the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—released its annual snapshot on the state of education in developed nations. The report showed that the United States is losing ground to other countries that have made sustained commitments in funding higher education opportunities. We are losing ground, and the legislation on the floor today—again, over a period of years raising interest rates extremely high—will make that bad situation even worse.

The United States once led the world in college graduates. As a result, interestingly enough, older Americans—those between age 55 and 64—still lead their peers in other nations around the world in the percentage with college degrees, which is 41 percent. But, according to a very thoughtful report from CNN, this number over the years has flatlined. In 2008—and this is a very sad story indeed—the same percentage of Americans age 25 to 34 and age 55 to 64 were college graduates. In other words, in that 30-year period we made no progress at all. During that period, as we all know, with the explosion of technology, what we have said to our young people is, you desperately need a college education. Yet, in terms of percentage of our people with college degrees, we are exactly where we were 30 years ago. Meanwhile, other countries all over the world have significantly surpassed us in terms of the number of people in those countries who are college graduates. In fact, right now, where once we were first in the world in terms of the percentage of our people who are college graduates, today we are 15th in the world.

Many people do not understand that today the U.S. Government is making huge profits off of higher education and

the loans we are providing to our young people and to their parents. In fact, the estimate is that we will make about \$184 billion in profits over the next 10 years. To my mind, making huge profits off of young people and their families who want nothing more than to fulfill the American dream of being able to go to college or graduate school and get out and earn a decent wage and make it into the middle class is obscene. We should not be profiteering off working families who are trying to send their kids to college. Yet, with the current legislation that will be on the floor, over a 10-year period we will be making \$184 billion in profit.

Some people say: We have a deficit. We need to go forward with deficit reduction. This will help us to the tune of \$184 billion in a 10-year period.

I say: If you want to do deficit reduction, don't take it out on working families, low-income families who are struggling to send their kids to college when one out of four major corporations in this country—many of which make billions of dollars a year in profit—is paying zero in taxes. If you want to do deficit reduction, ask those multinational corporations to start paying their fair share of taxes, not working families who are struggling.

Let's be clear about what this legislation that I expect will be on the floor shortly will do. It provides a variable interest rate. Let's look at what the CBO is telling us about where we may be going with interest rates in the coming years. What the CBO tells us is that in 2013 a 10-year Treasury note, on which this formula is based, is 1.81 percent; in 2014 it will be 2.57 percent; 2015, 3.35 percent; 2016, 4.24 percent; 2017, 4.95 percent. Those are CBO projections.

Based on the formula in this bill, here is what Americans will be paying for student loans. The good news is that because interest rates are low now, in 2013 it will be 3.86 percent for subsidized Stafford undergraduate loans; in 2014, 4.62 percent; 2015, 5.40 percent; 2016, 6.29 percent; 2017, 7 percent, according to CBO.

Under the graduate Stafford Loan Program, we are going to go from 5.4 percent to 6.1 percent, to 6.9 percent. In 2016, we will be at 7.8 percent and in 2017 we will be at 8.55 percent. By the way, all of those figures are below the cap in the bill.

What about the parents who are helping their students through the PLUS Loan Program? In 2013 it starts at 6.3 percent; 2014, 7 percent; 2015, 7.8 percent; 2016, 8.7 percent; 2017, 9.4 percent. In other words, people will get up here and say that initially interest rates will be low—because interest rates are low—but they are not telling us that in years to come interest rates are going to go up to unsustainable levels.

My amendment says: OK. Interest rates are low today. Let's take advantage of that fact, and let's sunset this bill in 2 years, where we can then have interest rates that are reasonably

low—not as low as I would like them—and will not be prohibitive. Then, through the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, we can sit down and deal with two issues: No. 1, how are we, on a long-term basis, going to provide affordable loans, scholarships, and grants to the people of this country who need to advance their education? No. 2, how are we going to deal with the entire issue of college affordability? College in the United States costs much more than it does in virtually every other country on Earth.

We have over \$1 trillion in debt in terms of college loans. College loans have tripled since 2004. Young people are graduating from college with \$27,000 in debt. That is average. Some students have more debt. I have talked to dentists who went to dental school and are now over \$200,000 in debt from their dental school bills.

We have a crisis right now, and it is a crisis which not only impacts the lives of millions of people and families in our country, it impacts our whole Nation economically in terms of whether we are going to have a well-educated workforce to compete in the global economy.

The legislation that is on the floor only makes a bad situation worse. The result of it will be more student debt than we currently have. The result of that legislation will be more young people who say: I don't want to get out of college and have a \$50,000 debt, so I am not going to go to college. I guess I will never make it to the middle class and never be able to contribute to the country I love in a way that I thought was possible. We have to do better than this legislation.

The last point I wish to make is a political point: elections matter. The Presiding Officer recently ran for office. I ran for office in November. President Obama ran for office. When we run for office, we tell the American people what we believe and what we are going to fight for. The end result of those elections is that Barack Obama won a decisive victory. He is the President of the United States. What he campaigned on is: I am going stand up for the middle-class. The other guys aren't going to do it, so I am going to do it. What I ran on—as well as many of my colleagues—was: We are going to stand up for the middle class.

The results came in, and you know what. Barack Obama won. We have a Democratic President. As of today, the Senate has 54 Democrats. My question is: Why, with a Democratic President and a strong Democratic majority in the Senate, are we looking at legislation which is virtually the same as the legislation passed by an extremely conservative Republican House of Representatives? How does that happen?

What are we telling our constituents who voted for us? We said we were going to stand for the middle class. If we are going to stand for the middle class, we are standing for the affordability of college. We need to stand up

for working-class kids so they can have the opportunity to be the first in their family—as I was in my family—to be able to go to college. We are talking to African-American kids and saying: You know what. There are alternatives to crime and jail. You too can go to college. Those are the people we are supposed to be talking to. I fear very much that the legislation that is coming to the floor will not do that. In fact, it will make people say: What is the difference? What is the difference between the House and the Senate?

I ask that my colleagues support my amendment. It will give us the time to come up with a long-term solution to a very serious problem.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise as the chair of the full Appropriations Committee in support of the fiscal year 2014 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill. At noon we will be voting on the motion to proceed. I am here in the strongest, most affirmative way to urge my colleagues to please vote yes so we can get on with this very important bill that was fashioned with bipartisan participation to literally get America moving again.

The Transportation-HUD appropriations bill for 2014, under the leadership of Senator MURRAY and the ranking member Senator COLLINS, is an outstanding effort. It shows what bipartisan consensus is and focuses on two things: America's infrastructure and transportation and meeting compelling human needs in housing and urban development, both of which contribute to creating jobs in the United States of America.

This is not a bill where jobs will be on a slow boat to China or a fast track to Mexico. It puts America on the right track to meet these needs in transportation.

There is a very good reason we need this bill. The American Society of Civil Engineers says the need for physical

infrastructure in our country is piling up. Steel rusts, asphalt wears out, and buildings need to be repaired, to be maintained.

It is not politics; it is physics. We have to make investments today so our Nation can grow. We still have an unemployment rate of over 7 percent.

So how do we get America moving? Public investment that creates private sector jobs.

That is what we like about transportation. This bill, under the leadership of Senators MURRAY and COLLINS, includes Federal aviation—that is a word for airports—the Federal Highway Administration, in which we need to build and repair, Amtrak, and also the National Transportation Safety Board. When there is an accident, they are on the job find out what the problems are.

This bill keeps America moving on land, sea, and in the air. But, most of all, it is about bread-and-butter issues. It meets real needs in real time in our communities, building roads and building community.

This is also why I am a strong supporter of the housing and urban development aspects in this bill. The Presiding Officer knows of my social work background; I know of his as a county executive—working hand in hand on the needs of the people in the Delmarva Peninsula. We know there is prosperity and pockets of poverty. This bill, through the community development block grants, helps meet these compelling needs—again, local needs decided by local leaders in real time. It also meets needs for the elderly and for the disabled.

The Senate bill provides an allocation, under my leadership, of \$54 billion in discretionary spending. This is in sharp contrast to the House bill, which provides \$10 billion less than the Senate. The House allocation fails to provide those resources in transportation. Senators MURRAY and COLLINS will go into that in more detail.

But what I want to be able to say is, under my leadership as the full committee chair, my subcommittees have marked up—with the budget bill passed under Senator MURRAY's leadership chairing the Budget Committee—a top line of \$1.058 trillion. Oh, my God, \$1 trillion. Well, remember, \$600 billion goes to defense, and \$400 billion comes to domestic needs. If ever there were domestic needs, it is in our physical infrastructure in meeting the tattered, worn aspects of our communities.

There is a much greater debate going on in our country now because of the Trayvon Martin-George Zimmerman situation. A debate has begun, really under our President's encouragement, on race, ethnicity, and other aspects.

Well, what we need to do is be able to take stock of ourselves—take stock of ourselves: how we treat one another, how we view one another. Do we view one another as enemies consistently, do we view them on street corners or in communities, or do we begin to look at how we build community in our neigh-

borhoods, starting with housing for the elderly, making sure the disabled are taken care of, having respect for one another, passing an education bill dealing with the student loans.

This bill will put Americans to work and also meet our compelling needs, and we can do it in a way that shows we can do smart spending to accomplish national goals.

I too want to reduce the public debt of the United States, but I am going to lower our unemployment rate. I am going to lower the rate of danger in our physical infrastructure. I also really want the motion to proceed to pass.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank the very able committee chairwoman of the Senate Appropriations Committee for her direction to our full committee to move forward on our appropriations bills. I am very proud that the transportation and housing bill will be the first of, hopefully, many bills to move through here, but I really thank her for her tremendous leadership, encouraging myself and my ranking member Senator COLLINS to move forward with our bill to the floor today. We will both be giving our opening statements. I know the ranking member on the full Appropriations Committee will be here as well.

The chairman of the Finance Committee has asked for some time to speak before Senator COLLINS and I move forward on our discussion of this bill today. So I will yield to him, and we will speak after he does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much. I also thank my friend from Maine for her indulgence. Believe me, I will be as short as I possibly can. I deeply appreciate their indulgence.

#### TAX CODE REFORM

I am here to basically say I believe we must very aggressively reform our Tax Code. It has not been updated since 1986. Since that date, it has built up barnacles, loopholes, deductions, credits. There have been 15,000 changes to the Tax Code since 1986, and there have been additions. There have not been subtractions.

Our code is out of date. Other countries have kept their tax codes up to date. They have ensured that their companies are more competitive with changes in their tax codes. We have not done so. Our American companies are losing out. They are losing out to other companies worldwide because our code has not kept up to date.

In fact, there is a recent survey by Harvard Business School. Harvard Business School surveyed over 10,000 of its graduates over a short period of time.

The conclusion of that survey, from those who responded, is America is starting to lose its competitiveness. We are losing out. Why? Many reasons. But

the one that bubbles up the most, the one that was most telling, is our Tax Code. Two reasons: One, they said, is the high rates. Our Tax Code's top rate, 35 percent for corporations, is much higher than is the rate for other countries worldwide. Other countries have lowered their top corporate rate. We have not lowered ours. As a consequence, when there is a merger, the consequence is that the headquarters ends up in another country, very simply because the tax rate in that country is lower than it is in the United States. The Anheuser InBev merger is one of many examples.

The second reason they give to the Code, why the U.S. Tax Code is causing the United States to be less competitive, is not only because our rates are higher but because our Code is so more complex. It is very difficult for people doing business in the United States or Americans doing business in the United States or people in other countries who work with the U.S. Tax Code to deal with our Tax Code because it is so complex.

In addition, our Code needs to be updated because it is so complex, not only from an international perspective but from a domestic perspective. Americans as individuals do not trust the Code. It is too complex. They cannot figure out their own returns. I might say, myself, it was not too many years ago I was sitting down at the kitchen table trying to figure out my own tax returns. I am not a wealthy man. Frankly, I had to give up. I could not figure it out. I felt un-American that I could not figure out my own taxes, especially as somebody who went to college, went to law school, is in the Senate. I still cannot do my own taxes. Something is not quite right there. Many Americans believe, as a consequence, that somebody else is getting some deductions and credits when they hire a fancy lawyer. They are getting credits and deductions that they are not getting.

Then small businesses. Small business has a devil of a time keeping up with rules and regulations, let alone tax provisions. They spend much more of their dollars on regulations, including tax returns, hiring CPAs to figure out the returns than big business does. It is usually the big business that can deal with the complexity of the Code. It is much more difficult for small businesses. The complexity of the Code is hurting our country because it is also hurting small business in America.

I might say too, as a couple of examples of the complexity, there are 42 definitions of a small business—42 different definitions in the Code of small business. There are either three or four definitions of a child. My Lord, you would think we all know what a child is. But there are three or four different definitions of what constitutes a child. There are many—I forgot the exact number—many different provisions in the Code with respect to the education deduction—education credit.

In my hand is a 90-page document explaining the education deductions alone—90-page document. You think the American family, American students have the patience to go through a 90-page document that explains which deductions are available and which are not? No way. That has got to be simplified. So we must simplify the Code, get rid of a lot of the junk, frankly.

I believe the approach we are taking in the Finance Committee is the correct approach. We have had over 50 hearings in the Finance Committee. We have had many sessions in the committee about what is next, as the occupant of the chair knows. The approach we are taking is very simple: We are starting with a clean slate. We are getting rid of all of the deductions, all of the credits. They total about \$1.2 trillion annually. We are getting rid of them all—\$12 trillion over 10 years. Get rid of them all, then start to build up which ones seem to make the most sense.

Senator HATCH and I are working together. This is a bipartisan bill. The ranking member of the Finance Committee and I are together in this approach. We have asked our colleagues on the committee, off the committee, all Senators both sides of the aisle: Give us your submissions. What do you want added back to the clean slate? Do you want anything added back? If you want something added back, how do you want to change it, how to tailor it? We are not going to stand here and mention lots of different ways it can be changed. Senators know what they are.

I think by working through Senators, it is more likely to be a better, a more solid, productive product. I urge all of my colleagues, send us your submissions. Send your submissions. There are a couple of Senators on the floor. I hope they have submitted their suggestions. They indicated they have. Good. I urge my colleagues to do so, because we are hearing directly from constituents.

We have a Web site. It is [taxreform.org](http://taxreform.org). There were 10,000 submissions from around the country of people telling us what they want. I submit, if our constituents are telling us how they want the Tax Code changed, at the very least we as Senators should also indicate how we would like to see the Tax Code changed and be in on the ground floor starting out, rather than having to come out on the floor and offer amendments, adding something back in that has to be paid for. If it is added back, I do not think that is something Senators want to do.

We will mark up the tax bill this fall. There is going to be a markup. There is going to be a markup this fall. I am guessing—I do not like to predict dates because sometimes they change, but sometime this fall, September, October, November, in there, we are going to mark up a tax bill.

I urge Senators to be ready. This is bipartisan. I have worked overboard. I

have had meetings personally with every single Senator about the Tax Code. At lunch today, for example, Chairman CAMP and I—we meet weekly. At lunch today, we are meeting with 10 House Members, 10 Senators—a total of 10. We call it “burgers and beer” every 2 weeks over at the Irish Times. That is symbolic, because that is where the last Tax Code in 1986 was in many respects put together. The more we get to know each other, get to know House Members—I must confess there are a couple of House Members whom I did not know and they did not know who I was.

We talk about kids, we talk about tax reform. It is a bonding process to get to know each other better. DAVE CAMP and I are going around the country. We went to the Twin Cities a couple of weeks ago, met with 3M, with management, with their employees, and met with a small bakery. It is called Bald Eagle Bakery. We are going to Philadelphia a week from next Monday. I think we are going over to Delaware; I am not sure. We will be up in New Jersey. I apologize to the Presiding Officer. It is New Jersey. We are going to Philadelphia and New Jersey for another session. There will be others. We are traveling around the country. We want to talk to people to see what they have to say.

I think this is the way to crack some of this partisan gridlock around here, this partisan deadlock around here. How? We are working together, low key, building from the bottom to the top with these sessions, these meetings, discussions, keep talking. Because we all know the Tax Code needs to be reformed. It is way dated. It is out of date.

A small example is all of the exempt provisions, the 501(c)(4)s and (3)s, and so forth. This has not been addressed for over 50 years. All of the money since Citizens United is tax exempt, trying to find a safe home; that is, where there is no disclosure of either donors or amount. That has got to be maybe addressed as well. That is just one example.

My main point is to first indicate there is going to be a markup. It is an opportunity for Senators to send in their submissions. The deadline is the end of this week. I urge all of my colleagues to do so.

Finally, I am very grateful for my friends from Maine and Washington for allowing me to take time. I thank them very much.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we spend far too much time here in the Senate scrambling to address short-term crises and far too little time working to tackle the serious long-term challenges facing our Nation. That is why I am very pleased the Sen-

ate will soon be considering the fiscal year 2014 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill. This transportation and housing bill received strong bipartisan support as it moved through the Appropriations Committee. It was reported out of subcommittee unanimously.

On June 27, the members of the full committee voted 22 to 8 to report this bill here to the Senate. This bill received this strong bipartisan support because it helps families and communities, it gets workers back on the job, it is fiscally responsible, and it lays down a strong foundation for long-term and broad-based economic growth.

Our transportation and housing bill is very different from the one that is moving through the House of Representatives right now, which passed out of their committee on a strict party-line vote. The Senate bill funds the highly successful TIGER Program to ensure support for transportation projects of national or regional significance. The House bill zeros out that funding and even takes away TIGER funding provided for this current year.

The Senate bill provides \$500 million to make necessary repairs to our Nation's bridges, when one in four bridges today across the country is classified as deficient. The House bill does not provide that critical funding. Our bipartisan Senate bill fully funds the Essential Air Service Program. The House bill kicks communities out of the program and then shortchanges the program.

On this side, our bill protects investments in our aviation infrastructure, while the House bill cuts spending we need to maintain and modernize the air traffic system by more than \$½ billion, to the lowest level since fiscal year 2000, more than a decade ago now.

The Senate bill maintains funding for the CDBG and HOME Programs, while the House bill proposes to cut both to their lowest levels ever. It preserves the Federal commitment to the mostly elderly and disabled tenants of public housing and section 8 project-based housing, while the intentional short funding of both programs in the House bill would ultimately lead to their demise.

The House bill falls short in these and many other areas because its investment level is simply unsustainable. It is even lower than sequester levels. Without adequate resources to fund core and housing programs, it cuts deeply and broadly and very few programs escape the axe.

The approach taken by the House should concern all of us, because this is not about politics, it is about our country. Investing in our infrastructure is something that brings together the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, major labor groups such as the AFL-CIO, economists, and policy experts across the entire political spectrum because, as any business owner will tell you, no matter how challenging the current environment, you never want to cut the



investments that allow you to compete and prosper once that crisis ends.

There are plenty of independent assessments showing that right now as a country we are not investing enough in our aging infrastructure, and no one—no one—is suggesting we invest too much. The fact is, if we slash our investments in infrastructure, we are not saving any money at all; we are making things worse. We are weakening our basis for private investment and economic growth. We are putting public safety at risk. We are allowing congestion to continue taxing families with painfully long commutes, long waits at airports, and health-threatening pollution.

Roads are going to need to be fixed eventually. Bridges are going to need to be strengthened at some point before they collapse. The air traffic control system will have to be modernized before air travel becomes too unreliable. Waiting will only make the work more expensive when we eventually do it. It is shortsighted and does not make any sense. That is why the bipartisan Senate bill supports critical investments in our Nation's infrastructure that are necessary to support and grow our economy. The investments included in our bill make it possible for people to get to work and products to get to market. Because other countries are investing in their infrastructure as quickly as they can, investments here in America are a key factor in making sure our country can compete and win in the 21st century global economy.

Our bipartisan bill also supports our local communities' efforts to promote economic development, supports small businesses, and creates affordable housing. These investments help create jobs and are necessary to ensure our Nation's economic competitiveness into the future. Our bill funds a critical piece of the safety net, housing assistance and homeless shelters for millions of families who are one step from the street. It moves us closer to finally eliminating homelessness among our Nation's veterans.

The need for these investments far exceeds the resources in this bill. But here in the Senate we have been able to keep our commitment to our States and our communities and ensure the agencies in the bill can meet their statutory responsibility. The House bill's untenable investment level and commitment to sequestration makes those commitments impossible to keep.

The Senate bill also works to improve the programs funded, including reforms that address concerns Members raised the last time the transportation and housing bill came to the Senate floor. Our bipartisan bill includes important section 8 reforms to reduce costs and create efficiencies. It contains reforms to improve the oversight of public housing agencies and boards, ensures accountability for property owners who don't maintain the quality of their HUD-assisted housing, and increases accountability in the CDBG

Program. The House bill doesn't include any of those reforms. Our bill also continues to require oversight by the offices of the inspectors general and GAO and incorporates their findings into the bill's guidance to agencies.

In short, our bill is a good bill, and, along with Senator COLLINS, I encourage Members to bring their amendments to the floor and to work with us to make this bill even better. This bill has broad bipartisan support because it takes a practical approach to addressing the real needs we find in the transportation and housing sectors. The investments it makes would create jobs and help the middle class right now, it would help lay down a strong foundation for long-term and broad-based economic growth, and it helps position our country and our economy to compete and win in the 21st-century global economy.

The approach taken by our House colleagues on their transportation and housing bill would cut investments in a way that may make our short-term budget deficit look better on paper but that would hurt our families, cost us far more in the long run, and hollow out our long-term investments and potential for economic growth. So I urge all our colleagues to help support our bipartisan bill and move us rapidly to final passage.

Again, before I yield, I wish to thank Chairwoman MIKULSKI, who was here a few moments ago, for her tremendous support and leadership. She was, as she stated, the former chair of the VA HUD subcommittee, and she really appreciates the importance of the investments this bill makes.

This bill does include the priorities of Members on both sides of the aisle, reflecting the bipartisan tradition in the Appropriations Committee. So I especially thank my entire subcommittee for their work, and I would like to take a moment to especially express my appreciation and thanks to my ranking member Senator COLLINS for all her hard work and cooperation throughout this process. I am very proud that together we have written a bill that works for families and communities.

Investing in our families and communities and long-term economic growth shouldn't be a partisan issue, and I think the bipartisan work that went into this bill and the strong support it received in committee proves it doesn't have to be.

I look forward to moving to this vote at noon today to allow us to get on the bill, and I encourage all our Members to bring their amendments to us. My ranking member Senator COLLINS and I will work our way through those as efficiently as we can so we can bring this bill to a conclusion.

Again, I thank Senator COLLINS for her tremendous work and her in-depth understanding of the tremendous issues within this bill, I thank her for working with us, and I yield to her at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I am pleased to join Chairman MURRAY as we begin floor consideration of the fiscal year 2014 appropriations bill for the Department of Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies. This return to regular order in which appropriations bills are considered individually, with the opportunity for full debate and for Members to come to the floor and offer their amendments, is welcome indeed.

Like Senator MURRAY, I wish to commend the two leaders of our Appropriations Committee—Senator MIKULSKI, the chair, and Senator SHELBY, the ranking member—for their commitment to returning to regular order. We simply must stop the irresponsible practice of waiting until the eleventh hour and then producing a bundled bill totaling thousands of pages with little or no opportunity for truly careful deliberation and debate.

I wish to thank our subcommittee chairman for working very closely with me to craft this bipartisan bill. She has been a tremendous leader of our subcommittee and has operated in a way that has been completely bipartisan.

This bill makes responsible investments in transportation and economic development and includes input and priorities from Members from both sides of the aisle. We listened to the concerns of our Members, and the bill was approved by a bipartisan vote of 22 to 8 in committee.

The fact is that the transportation and housing appropriations bill has a long tradition of bipartisan support. Every Senator has unmet transportation and housing needs in his or her home State, from crumbling roads and bridges, to economic development needs, to a growing population of low-income families, elderly, and disabled individuals who need our help.

According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, the condition of our Nation's infrastructure remains poor. Our roads, airports, and transit systems received a grade of D, while our bridges, ports, and rail systems received only a C. In fact, in my State of Maine the roads and bridges are among the worst in the Nation's rural transportation network. This matters because we need efficient and safe transportation networks to move our people around the country and to move our products to market.

The bill before us does not begin to solve all of our Nation's transportation and housing woes. We simply do not have the money to do that. After all, we cannot ignore the size of our unsustainable \$17 trillion national debt. We also cannot ignore the need for investments that will help the private sector create jobs and allow our people and products to travel safely and efficiently and our most vulnerable citizens to receive decent housing.

I understand that some Members are very concerned about supporting any

funding bill that has an allocation that is higher than the House counterpart. I certainly agree it is important that we adhere to current law, which limits spending to \$967 billion. But it is our responsibility to consider the merits of each of the Senate funding bills and produce bills based on our best judgments. Then we negotiate with our House counterparts in conference. That is the way the process is supposed to work. That is how we produce compromises. That is how we produce appropriations bills. The Senate should not be a rubberstamp for the House, nor should the House be a rubberstamp for the Senate. Each body should come forth with its individual appropriations bills, and then we should meet in conference, negotiate, and produce bills that can have the support of both bodies.

The fact is that the fiscal year 2014 House transportation and HUD allocation of \$44.1 billion is, in my judgment, insufficient to meet the true needs of both transportation and housing. In fact, the House allocation was \$51.6 billion just last fiscal year, so this year's House allocation reflects a dramatic cut. Could there be further cuts in our bill? Absolutely. I am sure there will be some worthwhile amendments offered on the Senate floor, and, more importantly, I believe that when we negotiate with our House counterparts we will produce a bill that is most likely somewhere in between the two allocations.

Our bill is by no means a perfect bill, but the House bill includes policy choices I believe most Senators will find problematic if they take a close look at the House provisions. Let me cite one example.

Our bill provides nearly \$3.2 billion for the Community Development Block Grant Program. The CDBG Program supports economic development leading to job creation across the country. I want to point out that the President's budget cut that program. It proposed \$2.8 billion, which is the lowest funding level since 1976, when President Gerald Ford was in office. The CDBG Program is one of the most popular Federal programs because of the flexibility it gives communities and States to tailor their economic development projects. Yet the House bill would cut the program even beyond the President's budget by reducing this important program by more than \$1.1 billion below the 1976 levels. That is when the program was first created in a Republican administration that recognized that States and communities are best able to use the flexibility of the Community Development Block Grant Program to meet the needs of their citizens, to spur downtown development, to create incentives for businesses to locate, and to produce good jobs.

Our bill also continues funding for the TIGER grant program, which supports transportation infrastructure projects that have a significant impact on the Nation, a region or metropoli-

tan area. The House bill not only eliminates this program but also rescinds funding for the current fiscal year by 50 percent. That means a round of grants that are just about to be funded could not go through.

For aviation programs our bill provides sufficient funding to ensure that the NextGen modernization efforts will continue to improve the efficiency, safety, and capacity of our aviation system.

With the lower funding levels as proposed by the House, here is the irony: We would simply end up paying more in the long term than we would now by providing the funding when it is needed.

So this program isn't a matter of whether we need it; it is when are we going to fund it. Funding it now, as we have been doing year after year in an incremental way, allows the NextGen Program for aviation to stay on track, and it will end up costing less than if we cut the funding and stretch it out over many more years.

Our bill also includes \$1.4 billion for Amtrak while the House bill provides only \$950 million. But in no way is the Senate funding extravagant. In fact, it is nearly \$1.2 billion less than the administration's request for Amtrak, and it avoids gimmicks that the Obama administration used in this account.

While the needs for Amtrak infrastructure far exceed what we were able to provide, our bill is a step in the right direction. Under the House proposal, Amtrak would be forced to consider cutting service, which could affect millions of passengers, diverting them to our already congested highways and busy airports.

In reality, the overall resources provided in this bill are well below the level of investment that our Nation's infrastructure requires, as the subcommittee chairman so correctly pointed out. Nevertheless, it would spur creation by the private sector of good jobs now, when they are needed most, and it would establish the foundations for future economic growth.

Just as important to our economic future, however, is reining in Federal spending. Getting our national debt under control must be a priority governmentwide. In setting priorities for the coming year, this bill strikes the right balance between thoughtful investment and fiscal restraint.

I appreciate the opportunity to present this important bill to our Chamber, to our colleagues. As we debate this bill, I urge our colleagues to support the motion to proceed to the compromises our committee worked so hard to achieve and, most of all, to come forward with suggestions for improvements through amendments.

Let me end by emphasizing that point. I have the assurance of the subcommittee chairman that Republicans will be allowed to offer amendments. So I would say to my colleagues: Even if you don't like this bill, there is no reason to oppose the motion to proceed

on the bill. You will be given an opportunity to offer amendments, to change the numbers in this bill, to cut programs if you wish. But let's get on this bill so we can return to the normal process of full and fair debate on individual appropriations bills, rather than waiting to the eleventh hour, bundling them together with little review, with insufficient care, deliberation, and debate or relying on continuing resolutions, stop-gap measures, which wreak havoc on the ability of programs to be carried out in a cost-effective manner.

I see our ranking member of the full committee is on the floor and I yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I thank the chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee Senator MIKULSKI for moving ahead to complete action on this, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill. This is the first bill reported by the Appropriations Committee to be considered by the Senate on the floor.

I believe it is important that Congress exercises constitutional authority over the funding of government. If we do not pass appropriations bills, the undesirable outcome is a government shutdown, which none of us wants. I believe, however, that the Senate is still on a precarious path.

The majority is pursuing a top-line discretionary spending level of \$1.058 trillion for the fiscal year 2014. This exceeds the Budget Control Act level by over \$90 billion. The Budget Control Act is the law that establishes and enforces, through sequestration, limits on discretionary spending.

In fiscal year 2013, most discretionary programs were forced to take arbitrary across-the-board cuts. We did not have to go in that direction for 2014. Over 1 month ago, all Republican members of the Appropriations Committee signed a letter to Chairwoman MIKULSKI calling for a top-line number of \$967 billion that complies with the law.

There could have been an alternative to sequestration. The Appropriations Committee could have written spending bills that adhered to the budget constraints of the law. This would have allowed Congress, not an indiscriminate formula, to make spending cuts of its choosing and to establish priorities, which we ultimately will have to do.

This level would have also given Senate and House appropriators a better chance to conference individual bills. Instead, several of the appropriations bills between the two Chambers are so far apart that aligning them would be difficult, if not impossible.

Regrettably, because of this disagreement, the endgame will probably be a continuing resolution. Every year that we have a continuing resolution or a series of them is another year that we drift further away from the regular order. In addition, even a continuing resolution for 2014 based on this year's



discretionary spending would require another sequester under the Budget Control Act.

Given the direction we are headed, I wish to vote against all appropriations bills that adhere to a total of \$1.058 trillion. It is not because the bills are entirely unworthy of support. That is not true. It is because they will ultimately lead us to a statutory dead end and erode the ability of Congress to control how the government is funded, as we have done before.

Therefore, I intend to oppose the motion to proceed, not because I don't think the bill has merit, as I said, but because in many ways it does. I will oppose the motion to proceed because it will inevitably lead us, once again, to an impasse that will result in further continuing resolutions and take us further away from any semblance of regular order.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, shortly the Senate will move to a vote on the motion to proceed to the transportation-housing bill.

This is the first appropriations bill to come before the Senate. We have worked very hard, in a bipartisan way, to have a bill that invests in the projects that are important to this country, to move us forward, and help secure a strong future for this country.

It is a bill that was tough to write. Our allocation is much lower than those of us who are working on these issues would like to see it, but we have tried to be pragmatic and practical and move forward.

I know there are those Members of the Senate who make the argument that our allocation is higher than the House and would vote against these bills. I would remind all of our colleagues, I have been out on this floor innumerable times urging our colleagues to let us go to conference on the budget so we can work out this disagreement and be able to have allocations be the same from the House and the Senate. But we have been unable to do that because a small group of Senators on the other side have objected to us going to that conference. So we are at the place now where we have to move these appropriations bills forward. It does mean eventually we will have to get to a conference and, as my ranking member pointed out, we will have to work out an agreement. But until we can go to conference and work out the overall number, we have to move forward on these bills; otherwise, we are going to face a crisis come the end of September in terms of funding our government and giving certainty to people across this country about whether we will be allocating funds for them to be able to move forward on their budgets at the local and State levels.

I urge our colleagues to vote yes, allow us to move to this bill. As my

ranking member has said, bring your amendments to the floor. If you have an objection to something in the bill or you want to change something or you want a discussion about something, we will be here, ready to take amendments, look at them, and have the will of the Senate move forward.

In a few short minutes, we will move to that vote and I urge our colleagues to vote yes.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 99, S. 1243, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

Mark Begich, Barbara A. Mikulski, Patty Murray, Mark R. Warner, Tom Udall, Martin Heinrich, Angus S. King, Jr., Sheldon Whitehouse, Elizabeth Warren, Dianne Feinstein, Patrick J. Leahy, Tom Harkin, Jack Reed, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Mary L. Landrieu, Jeff Merkley, Harry Reid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1243, an original bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 73, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 181 Leg.]

#### YEAS—73

Baldwin	Blunt	Cardin
Baucus	Boozman	Carper
Begich	Boxer	Casey
Bennet	Brown	Chambliss
Blumenthal	Cantwell	Chiesa

Cochran	Kaine	Reed
Collins	King	Reid
Coons	Kirk	Rockefeller
Donnelly	Klobuchar	Sanders
Durbin	Landrieu	Schatz
Feinstein	Leahy	Schumer
Flake	Levin	Shaheen
Franken	Manchin	Stabenow
Gillibrand	Markay	Tester
Hagan	McCain	Thune
Harkin	McCaskill	Toomey
Hatch	Menendez	Udall (CO)
Heinrich	Merkley	Udall (NM)
Heitkamp	Mikulski	Warner
Heller	Murkowski	Warren
Hirono	Murphy	Whitehouse
Inhofe	Murray	Wicker
Isakson	Nelson	Wyden
Johnson (SD)	Portman	
Johnson (WI)	Pryor	

#### NAYS—26

Alexander	Cruz	Paul
Ayotte	Enzi	Risch
Barrasso	Fischer	Roberts
Burr	Graham	Rubio
Coats	Grassley	Scott
Coburn	Hoeben	Sessions
Corker	Johanns	Shelby
Cornyn	Lee	Vitter
Crapo	McConnell	

#### NOT VOTING—1

Moran

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 73 and the nays are 26. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Under the previous order, cloture having been invoked, all postcloture time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, the Senate has now agreed on a bipartisan basis to move forward on the transportation and housing bill. I wish to thank all of our colleagues.

As we move forward on this appropriations bill, we will be open for amendments. I know there are Members who have a number of issues they would like for us to consider. I urge them to bring their amendments to Senator COLLINS and me, the managers of this bill, as soon as possible so we can begin to work our way through them.

So as we go to recess for caucus lunches, I ask Members to please work with both of us so we can manage this bill in a responsible way and then move to final passage.

I appreciate all of the work of my ranking member Senator COLLINS as well as the members of the committee and all of the Senators who are working with us to move this bill forward.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1243) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related

agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

# RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:31 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the President pro tempore (Ms. BALDWIN).

## TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

### HUMAN TRAFFICKING IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CHIESA. Madam President, it is an honor for me to speak here today for the first time on the floor of this distinguished body.

I am mindful of the fact that had it not been for the passing of my predecessor, Senator Frank Lautenberg, I would not be here today. So I want to associate myself with the tributes that have already been paid to his memory.

It has occurred to me that if I waited any longer before speaking on the Senate floor for the first time, my maiden speech and my farewell address would be one and the same.

My service representing the people of New Jersey in this great institution will be brief. Yet, for me, I know it will be one of the highlights of my life.

I wish to express my heartfelt appreciation to my family—my wife Jenny and my children, Al and Hannah—for enthusiastically supporting the decision we made as a family to allow me to be here. As everyone in public life knows, the support of our families is indispensable to our service. My daughter Hannah is here with me in Washington this week supporting her dad.

I am also incredibly grateful to Governor Christie for the confidence he has again shown in me by naming me to this position. I am deeply humbled by the opportunity to serve the people of my State—the State where I was born and raised and am raising my own family—here in the Senate.

Some refer to Senators who have been appointed to unexpired vacancies as “caretakers.” I reject that label for myself, as I imagine others have who have found themselves in similar positions. No one who has the high honor and privilege of serving in this body should ever be content to serve as a caretaker—to merely “keep the seat warm.” Representing the people even for a brief period of time demands that one work to make a difference. My Senate colleagues show me that every day with their commitment.

Today I wish to use this great honor to help give voice to a shockingly large and largely unseen group of people who have no voice of their own. The United Nations estimates there are upwards of 27 million of them around the globe.

There are believed to be at least 100,000 of them here in the United States. They are among the most exploited, abused, and neglected people on the face of the Earth. They are the victims of human trafficking. They are, to be more direct, modern-day slaves.

Over the course of my career, both as an assistant U.S. attorney and more recently as the attorney general of New Jersey, I have come face to face with the terrible misery of human trafficking. The faces of its victims are haunting. They are often young, and more often than not they are female. They come from every corner of the world but especially from those places where poverty and want define day-to-day existence. They are exploited and abused by human predators that have no respect for the law and no respect for basic decency. Often lured by their captors with empty promises of a better life, the victims are instead utterly betrayed. These victims are robbed of their youth, their freedom, their dignity, their health, and sometimes even their lives. They must not be forgotten. They must not be robbed of justice.

Human traffickers—the purveyors of the modern-day slave trade—do enormous harm to their victims. When these victims are used in the promotion of such crimes as prostitution and child pornography, they are also debasing our neighborhoods and our families. As they exploit their victims by forcing them to labor for little or no money in a wide variety of workplaces and appalling circumstances, they are also exploiting employers who offer good jobs, at fair wages, in safe working conditions. And as they abuse their victims in ways too horrible to contemplate, they are also abusing our commitment as a society to honor the dignity of every human being.

My first exposure to the fight against human trafficking goes back to my tenure as an assistant U.S. attorney in New Jersey. And as New Jersey’s attorney general, I made this fight a priority, issuing a directive on human trafficking to sharpen New Jersey’s focus in the fight against this terrible crime by channeling more resources and greater attention to the problem.

This effort is already producing results. Just over a week ago the New Jersey Attorney General’s Office arrested six people in Lakewood, New Jersey, and charged them with various human trafficking and other offenses. Accused of running a sophisticated network that brought dozens of women into the United States from Mexico to work in illegal brothels, those arrested in Lakewood will also face new, tougher penalties if convicted. And their victims have been saved from the degradation to which their captors were subjecting them. As satisfying as it is to see justice done to the traffickers, there is an even greater sense of accomplishment in restoring freedom to those who were brutally held in bondage.

There are, of course, efforts under way to find and prosecute traffickers both at home and abroad, as well as to identify and aid the innocent victims of human trafficking. The Department of State’s Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons leads our Nation’s efforts to combat human trafficking around the world. The Department of Homeland Security’s Blue Campaign works with law enforcement, State and local governments, various nongovernmental organizations, and other private groups to provide information, training, and outreach. Countless law enforcement officers and prosecutors at every level of government are united in the fight to end human trafficking. And untold numbers of organizations and caring people have committed themselves to aiding the survivors of this terrible assault on human dignity.

In this body, the Senate Caucus to End Human Trafficking, led by my distinguished colleagues, the senior Senator from Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and the junior Senator from Ohio, Mr. PORTMAN, helps to “combat human trafficking by promoting awareness, removing demand, supporting prosecution efforts, and providing appropriate service systems for survivors.” I fully support their outstanding efforts and look forward to working with them on this important issue.

And there is more we can do. Having served recently as attorney general, I know the States—and specifically the State attorneys general—feel hampered in their efforts to put an end to the insidious practice of using the Internet to sell illegal sexual services, especially when exploiting the victims of human trafficking.

I urge my colleagues to carefully consider any proposals that may come forward to close loopholes in the Federal law that are furthering the victimization of young women being held in bondage.

There are, unfortunately, no easy answers. Human trafficking can be hard to detect and even harder to prove. It is not unusual for victims to be unaware that they are victims of a crime. Their captors are often successful at persuading their victims that what is happening to them is their own fault. And because of the incessant and violent intimidation to which victims are subjected, they may be afraid to even attempt to escape the situation in which they find themselves. Fearing retaliation from their captors or perhaps afraid they may be deported or returned to the situation they sought to escape from in the first place, they are reluctant to seek help, or even to offer help in punishing their captors once they are freed.

The challenge faced in fighting human trafficking is compounded because not enough people—even people in law enforcement and the justice system—recognize it when they confront it. That is why efforts to promote

greater awareness of the signs of human trafficking are indispensable to the success of this fight. And everyone can take up this cause in their own way.

One of the more inspiring efforts has been initiated by a group of middle and high school students from my State. In 2010, under the guidance of Dan Papa, an extraordinary social studies teacher, students at the Jefferson Middle School in Jefferson Township, New Jersey, formed an organization called Project Stay Gold. The students participating in Project Stay Gold have created a Web site, pieces of art, and launched an innovative mobile project to raise and spread awareness of human trafficking. The students and their teacher have set some ambitious goals for their work. One of those goals is to enlist the help of the NFL to raise awareness of human trafficking in advance of Super Bowl 48. As a New Jerseyan, that is a goal I share.

The people of New Jersey are excited to be hosting this coming year's Super Bowl at the world-class MetLife Stadium. We look forward to the playing of the first outdoor cold-weather Super Bowl in history. But New Jersey is also determined to prevent the usual influx of victims of human trafficking who, it is widely acknowledged, have in the past been brought against their will to the host cities of large international events such as the Super Bowl as part of the illegal sex trade. I will be working with everyone involved in presenting the Super Bowl—including the National Football League and the host committee—to raise awareness and to eliminate this insidious practice. I know Mr. Papa and the students involved at Project Stay Gold at Jefferson Middle School will enthusiastically join me in this effort.

Each of us has the opportunity to help give voice to the voiceless victims of human trafficking. That is why I intend to focus much of the time I do have in this body to advancing the goal of ending human trafficking and aiding the victims of this terrible crime. I look forward to working with all of my colleagues and with all of those who share my commitment to this fight.

Finally, as someone who is new here and will not be staying long, permit me to express my appreciation to so many of my colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, who have been extraordinarily generous with their time, their knowledge, and wisdom in helping me meet the awesome responsibility I have been entrusted with. Senator MCCONNELL has been especially helpful to me. He is a leader not just by title but by the way he conducts himself every day in this body. I also wish to thank my fellow New Jerseyan, Senator MENENDEZ, whose collegiality and guidance have been of great assistance to me in my transition.

The Senate has long been guided by ancient traditions that have served the institution and the Nation well. I trust that in the months and years ahead, it

will continue to honor the practices that have caused it to be known as the world's greatest deliberative body. I will certainly try to do my part during my time here to honor those traditions and uphold the special and unique place this body holds in our system of governance.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I wish to say briefly to our friend Senator CHIESA how much we appreciate his remarks here today. I am reminded of what the author of Ecclesiastes points out: "Time and chances happen to us all." While he may not be with us a long time here in the Senate, I have every confidence, given his tremendous track record of public service and the confidence Governor Christie has had in him to make this appointment, that we will be hearing more great things about Senator CHIESA in the future.

#### THE ECONOMY

Madam President, President Obama is scheduled to give a major speech on the economy tomorrow. Unfortunately, according to press reports, his new ideas for bolstering job creation bear a remarkable resemblance to his old ideas—ideas that have given us the weakest economic recovery and the longest period of high unemployment since the Great Depression. The President will probably quite effectively talk about "winning the future" and helping America's youth compete in the global economy. But speeches are more than just words; they have to be about policies. Unfortunately, on that count, notwithstanding the fact that President Obama is a marvelous speech maker, his policies have resulted, as I said, in a weak economic recovery, a less prosperous America, and more debt and burden for our young people looking for a way out.

The problem is that President Obama, not his speeches but his actual policies have done tremendous damage to the economic prospects of the same people he purports to be championing. Indeed, this Obama economy has threatened to create a lost generation of younger Americans who are drowning in debt and are unable to find good full-time jobs.

First, on the issue of debt, since President Obama took office, the Federal Government has accumulated more than \$6.1 trillion in new debt. Let me repeat that. Since President Obama took office, the Federal Government has accumulated more than \$6.1 trillion in new debt. I doubt anyone within the sound of my voice can actually conceptualize how much money that really is, but under the President's latest budget proposal, that debt would grow even higher—by another \$8.2 trillion—over the next decade. The gross debt is now larger than our entire economy, which is why every American child enters the world owing \$53,000. We might as well call them "generation debt."

Unemployment, as I mentioned earlier, remains intractable. The unemployment rate among young adults age 18 to 29 is 12.7 percent. For the general population it is 7.6 percent, but for those 18 to 29 it is 12.7 percent. That figure rises to 16.1 percent when we include 1.7 million young adults who have simply given up finding a job. Of course, these are real live human beings, not just statistics, but the statistics are bad enough.

Then there is the lack of good full-time jobs. Last year the Associated Press reported that half of all recent college graduates are either jobless or employed in positions that don't fully use their skills and knowledge. A separate study in 2012 found that only 4 out of every 10 recent college graduates are doing a job that actually requires a 4-year degree. It has been estimated that 41 percent of all underemployed Americans are below the age of 31. And as we have learned, because of the ObamaCare employer mandate, many full-time jobs are being reduced to part-time jobs, especially in the hotel, restaurant, and retail industries.

In a new survey, 74 percent of small businesses said they are going to reduce hiring, reduce worker hours, or replace full-time employees with part-time employees. In other words, it is not just the slowly growing economy, it is actually the policies of this administration which are making it significantly harder for younger Americans to find decent employment.

Then, of course, there is the unkept promise of ObamaCare. The President extravagantly promised: If you like what you have, you can keep it. For a family of four, your premiums are going to be reduced by \$2,500 on average.

Well, we found out that for millions of Americans, if they like the coverage they have, they cannot keep it and will lose it, and that instead of a \$2,500 reduction in premiums, an average family of four will see an increase of \$2,400.

Once it is fully implemented, younger people will be especially burdened. They will pay much higher health insurance premiums than they are today. Indeed, a recent survey of large health care insurers found that premium costs for young and healthy Americans in the individual and small group market will "increase by an average of 169 percent." According to the Wall Street Journal, "Healthy consumers could see insurance rates double or even triple when they look for individual coverage" under ObamaCare.

It is not hard to understand why. Under ObamaCare's provisions you can wait until you actually get sick before your buy insurance under a concept known as "guaranteed issue," which then hardly resembles insurance as any of us think about it. And then because of the so-called age banding phenomenon, where premiums for older people cannot be any more than three times what they are for younger people, what is going to happen is younger

people are going to have to pay higher premiums to subsidize the higher cost of caring for people when they get older.

Then there is the triple whammy, perhaps, of higher education costs, some of which we are trying to address here with bipartisan student loan reform. But under President Obama, the average cost of tuition and fees at a 4-year public college or university has increased 27 percent. Again, we have been talking about: How do we deal with the interest rates on that debt? But the fact is the principal has gone up 27 percent in the last 5 years.

For that matter, it is estimated that 4 out of every 10 Americans who graduated from college in 2009, 2010, or 2011 have not been able to pay off any of their student debt. As a longtime Silicon Valley businessman recently noted: The millennials are the “most educated” generation in American history, but they are also the “most indebted.”

Is there any wonder that only one out of every five recent college graduates says their generation will be more successful than the one that came before them?

My parents were part of the so-called “greatest generation”—Tom Brokaw coined that title—the World War II generation, people who risked everything they had and sacrificed all they had in order to ensure my brother and my sister and I would have a better life and have more opportunities. Unfortunately, as a result of the failed policies we have seen over the last 5 years, recent college graduates actually believe they are going to have less opportunity and less prosperity than generations that came before them.

There is no reason why that has to be the case. There is no good reason why the Obama economy has to become the new normal—not in a country as hard working, entrepreneurial, and innovative as the United States of America.

Here in Washington, many policymakers seem to have forgotten the recipe, the “secret sauce,” if you will, for long sustainable economic growth. I would invite them to visit my State of Texas, which has been luring job creators from all across the Nation. And, lo and behold, you find that when people have opportunity and jobs, they tend to vote with their feet, which is one reason why, after the last census, we had four new congressional seats created in Texas, because people had literally shifted from parts of the country where they could not find jobs to places such as Texas where they could.

Here is an interesting comparison, as shown on this chart.

In 2010, the Texas economy grew 71 percent faster than the national economy—71 percent. In 2011, it grew 125 percent faster, and last year it grew 92 percent faster. These numbers reflect more than just happenstance. They reflect the difference between the policies that are embraced here in Washington, DC, and the policies embraced in my State.

For example, here in Washington, over the last 4 years, President Obama’s policies have actually made it harder for businesses to create jobs because of taxes, because of regulation, because of things such as the cost of ObamaCare.

In Texas, by comparison, we have worked very hard to make it easier. Indeed, if you want more of something, it seems to me you would make it easier to create, not harder, which is why Chief Executive magazine has named Texas the Best State for Business 8 years in a row.

Here in Washington, President Obama’s policies have seen an increase in taxes by \$1.7 trillion and increased our national debt by \$6.1 trillion, as I mentioned earlier.

In Texas, we have no State income tax, and we recently turned a \$5 billion deficit into a projected \$8.8 billion surplus, thanks to the leadership of our Governor and the members of the State legislature.

Here in Washington, President Obama has presided over the weakest economic recovery and the longest period of high unemployment since the Great Depression.

In Texas, the total number of jobs has grown by nearly 32 percent since 1995, while the total number of jobs nationwide has grown by 12 percent—32 percent versus 12 percent.

Here in Washington, President Obama’s policies have actually hampered one of our greatest natural resources—energy production on Federal lands, to be specific.

In my State public policies have consistently encouraged energy development, and total statewide oil production has increased by 94 percent between September 2008 and September 2012. I say that at the same time we are the No. 1 producer of electricity from wind energy. We believe in truly an “all of the above” approach.

But Texans are unapologetic about our desire to create high-paying jobs in the oil and gas sector and produce the energy needed to power our State and the Nation. All you have to do is look at the phenomenon occurring in the Eagle Ford shale in Central to South Texas and the Permian Basin in West Texas.

Indeed, the Eagle Ford shale produced 358 barrels of oil per day in 2008. Last year, it produced more than 352,000 barrels of oil a day. Over that same period, the number of Eagle Ford drilling permits increased from 26 to more than 4,100.

At a time when we see the Middle East continuing its trend of being a dangerous place, why in the world wouldn’t we want to develop more of our natural resources here at home and create jobs at the same time to relieve our dependency on imported oil and gas from dangerous parts of the world?

In the Midland area, which is part of the Permian Basin, high school graduates can earn \$75,000 a year as a starting job driving a truck. Many students

aspire to all sorts of other jobs, and they are trained for it. But the point is energy production, taking advantage of the innovation and the technological changes in oil and gas production, can create jobs and opportunities and help wean us from imported energy.

Here in Washington, unfortunately, the administration is still clinging to the misguided policies that are preventing the United States from reaching its full domestic energy potential.

Consider these numbers: Between 2007 and 2012, total U.S. natural gas production increased by 20 percent, total U.S. oil production went up by 22 percent. However, oil production on Federal lands—that is subject to the control of the Federal Government—actually went down 4 percent, while natural gas production on Federal lands dropped by 33 percent.

How do you reconcile the disparity? Well, the oil and gas and natural gas production occurred on private lands, owned by private parties, not the Federal Government. So the Federal Government’s record is actually quite dismal in comparison.

So the message to President Obama—as he pivots once again to the economy—the message could not be more obvious: If the President really does care about “winning the future” and helping the millennial generation compete in a globalized world, he should abandon the policies that have saddled younger Americans with so much debt and made it so difficult for them to find good jobs. In short, it is time to replace the Obama model with the Texas model.

This chart makes the comparison I mentioned earlier. Economic growth in 2010—after the 2008 fiscal meltdown, we saw the national economy growing only at 2.4 percent, the Texas economy at 4.1 percent. We need to get the national economy growing closer to 4 percent in order to create the jobs that are necessary to give young people an opportunity to work and provide for their families and to build for their future.

In 2011, we saw, actually, the national economy slow down at 1.6 percent growth. Indeed, the Texas economy slowed down a little more, albeit at 3.6 percent growth.

Then, in 2012—just last year—while we still saw the national economy bouncing along at the bottom with only 2.5-percent economic growth, the Texas economy was growing at 4.8 percent.

I know my friends from other parts of the country might discount my remarks here today and say: Well, this is just a Senator from a State who is proud of the accomplishments of his State and the people who have made it possible. They would be right. I am. But this is also about what Louis Brandeis once called the laboratories of democracy.

That is one reason why it is so important not to just have a national government but a Federal government

with national responsibilities in those areas that the States and individuals cannot otherwise take care of themselves, and reserving, as the 10th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution points out, all other power not delegated to the Federal Government to the States and to individuals. That is what protects our freedom, and that is what creates these laboratories of democracy so Texas, so Illinois, so Washington State—any other State; Wisconsin—can try these policies and see what works and what does not, what creates the prosperity and opportunity for their people. And, hopefully, just hopefully, we in Washington, DC—those of us who happen to work here as part of our job—will embrace those policies and those success stories and make them possible for the rest of the country as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

#### HEALTH CARE AND EDUCATION

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, first, let me join the Texas Chamber of Commerce and everyone else and thank Senator CORNYN for his promotional speech on behalf of the State of Texas. He is very proud of his State. I am sure I would be too if I represented it. I represent a State called Illinois, and we are pretty happy with what we have in our State. If the Senator's Governor comes in looking for jobs and he looks longingly at Lake Michigan and they wish they had some water in Texas, we have a lot of it and a lot of other things too.

Each of us is proud of our State, and I am not going to sit here and go through a tick list, even if I could, of what is wrong with Texas. I would like to speak to some of the national issues, though, that the Senator from Texas raised.

What about this ObamaCare? If you listen to the description by the Senator from Texas, it is the big hand of government coming down and raising the cost of health insurance for Americans.

Well, why would they do that? Why would Congress pass something like that? It turns out that is not even part of the story. Here is the story: Too many Americans today do not have health insurance. They still get sick. And when they get sick, what do they do? They go to the hospital—usually the emergency room—and they get treated.

If they do not have the money through health insurance to pay for it, how does it get paid for? Raise your hand America. If you own an insurance policy, you are paying for the care of those without health insurance, transferring the cost of their care to the rest of America. Is that fair to your family or to your business or to you? No.

The idea behind ObamaCare was to extend the reach of health insurance to more Americans. We tried this. The Senator from Texas talks about the States as laboratories of experiment. We tried this experiment under some-

one named Gov. Mitt Romney of Massachusetts. He came up with the original ObamaCare, RomneyCare in Massachusetts, and said: Everybody in the State is going to have health insurance. It is working.

We are trying to do this on a national basis so everyone is engaged in paying for their health care and so everyone has the peace of mind of being protected with a health insurance policy. What about these policies? There is another thing not raised by the Senator from Texas. What good is a health insurance policy if it is not there when you need it? What good is a health insurance policy if it has a limit on how much it will pay and someone you love in your family just got diagnosed with a serious cancer illness and now faces surgeries, chemo, radiation that could run into the tens of thousands of dollars well beyond the coverage of your policy?

That is when people face reality. That is what ObamaCare was all about. Take the lifetime limits off health insurance so that if some unpredictable accident, disease or illness comes your way, it will not bankrupt your family and you can still get good care. Those who want to abolish ObamaCare ought to answer the basic question: Do you want to go back to lifetime limits when it comes to health insurance?

There is another element too. We have some younger people in the Senate. But some of us have been around. Many of us are in a position where pre-existing conditions apply to all of us. If you had to fill out that questionnaire, there is probably something in your background, if you are in your fifties, sixties or beyond, that would be characterized as a preexisting condition. It might mean, in the old days, health insurance companies would say: No thanks. We do not want to run the risk of somebody who has high blood pressure, someone who has a prediabetes condition, someone with a person in their family with mental illness.

So they would not sell you the health insurance—preexisting conditions. In America, almost every family has one, whether it is a child or someone who is up in years. ObamaCare says stop discriminating against Americans under health insurance policies for pre-existing conditions.

When we hear the Republicans talk about eliminating ObamaCare, do they want to go back to the day when you could not even buy a health insurance policy with a preexisting condition?

What about this issue of insurance through your business where you work? It turns out 96 percent of the businesses in America today would not be mandated to provide health insurance coverage. They already do or they would not be required under the law. We are talking about a small percentage but an important percentage. The President said he will give us an additional year to make sure we get this right and work with business for the right solution. I think that is reason-

able. I have said it before, and I will say it again, when it comes to writing laws, the only perfect law ever written was written on clay tablets and carried down a mountain by Senator Moses.

Ever since then, we have done our best and we can always do better. But here is the problem: The National Restaurant Association came to Chicago about 6 weeks ago, genuinely concerned about ObamaCare and what it meant to their industry. I listened to them. I said: I am willing to sit down with you. Let's find a way to help you and businesses just like you provide health insurance that is affordable for your employees, that is the right thing for them. I said: I will tell you what. I guarantee you, if you are willing to sit down and work out changes in ObamaCare in a good-faith way, I will bring Democratic Senators to the table. All I ask you is bring Republican House Members to the table.

They cannot do it. You know why? The Presiding Officer knows why because she served in the House of Representatives. Because on 67 separate occasions since we passed ObamaCare, the Republicans in the House and Senate have called for votes to abolish ObamaCare—67 times. Someone—Dana Milbank, I believe, in the Washington Post—made that calculation just last week—67 times.

They have been unwilling to sit down and talk about any changes. No, we want to abolish it. Then we will talk. It does not work that way. In the real world, we try to solve these problems as we go. I know this ObamaCare is important to this country. I think it may be the most important bill I ever voted on—because I have been there. I was a young father, a law student, married with a baby with a serious medical problem. I had no health insurance. If you ever felt helpless as an individual, as a father, as a husband, get yourself in that position. There are millions of Americans who face that every single day: no health insurance and a heart-breaking illness in their family. Let's put an end to that. This country is far better than that. Let's aspire to something that truly provides peace of mind to those across America.

There are several other provisions in this bill I will mention before I talk about higher education. Under ObamaCare, we make certain that families with children under the age of 26 can keep their kids under their health insurance policy, the family's health insurance policy. Why is that important? Because young people coming fresh out of college may not have a job or they may have a job without health insurance. These young people can now stay under their parents' policy, over 100,000 in my State of Illinois.

When I hear the Republicans call for abolishing ObamaCare, I do not hear them calling for abolishing that. That is something families need and want. In our closing the doughnut hole—that is the amount of out-of-pocket expense seniors have to pay for Medicare prescriptions. ObamaCare closes that so

the out-of-pocket expenses diminish and eventually disappear. That is a good thing for many seniors faced with fixed incomes. I do not hear the Republicans calling for abolishing that either and they should not.

The Senator from Texas raised the question about the cost of higher education. He is right. I believe he characterized it by saying, under the Obama administration, the cost of higher education has gone up dramatically. It is true it did happen after the President was elected, but I did not hear the suggestion from the Senator from Texas that President Obama mandated it or caused it.

What is happening across America is that States, because of their own budget problems, are cutting back on aid to higher education. Colleges, mainly public institutions, are raising the cost of tuition, and that raises the debt the students end up with when they go to school. It has nothing to do with President Obama.

It is a fact, a serious fact, which brings us to the issue that will be on the floor this week, student loans. Currently, the student loan interest rate for subsidized loans, and that is for families having \$30,000 in income or less, is 6.8 percent. Just a few weeks ago it was 3.4 percent. Now it is 6.8 percent. So the question is, Are we going to change it? Are we going to try to bring down that interest rate?

Yes, we should. Students are deeply in debt, too deeply in debt. If we can reduce the cost of what they borrow, we should. Let me add a caveat. Students need to think twice about borrowing. Of course they should go to college, but many of them are being lured into schools that are dramatically overpriced. Some of them are not worth it. That is a fact.

The for-profit college industry is a good illustration. Ask a high school student if they know what a for-profit school is, they will say: I am not sure. What is it? It is the one that hits you right between the eyes on the Internet every time you log on. Those are the for-profit schools that are literally companies that make money off of offering education.

The largest, the University of Phoenix. The combined enrollment at the University of Phoenix is larger than the combined enrollment of the Big Ten schools; No. 2, Kaplan, which owns the Washington Post; and No. 3, DeVry out of Chicago. Those are the three big ones. What about those schools? There are three numbers to remember about for-profit schools if you want to know. About 12 percent of all of the kids coming out of high school go to for-profit schools. The for-profit schools receive 25 percent of all the Federal aid to education. The for-profit schools account for 47 percent of all the student loan defaults.

Why? They charge too much. Their diplomas are worth too little. The good advice to young people is: Start with your community college, if you do not

have a clear path for higher education—affordable, many choices. In most States those hours are transferable. But students are making high-cost choices and getting high-cost debt.

So now we are discussing what to do about it. This morning my friend, the Senator from Vermont, the Independent Democrat, BERNIE SANDERS came to the floor and talked about the plight of young people. He is right. They are too deeply in debt. There are too few jobs available. I worry about them, as everyone should.

He concluded, though, at the end, we should not vote for the bipartisan student loan reform bill we are working on in the Senate. I have to disagree with my colleague. Here is the reality. The interest rate today for undergraduate students is at least 6.8 percent on their student loans. Our bipartisan plan reduces that to 3.8 percent, a 3-percent savings for each student borrowing—undergrad student borrowing for the loans they need to go to school.

Three percent makes a difference; 6.8, 3.8 makes a big difference. Also, we make it clear that these students are going to be protected in the long run from high interest rates. We put a cap on the interest rates that students will ever have to pay under our plan of 8.25 percent for undergrad students. That to me is a sensible approach to take.

We are trying to find a way to lower this even further. I believe in the premise that the Federal Government should be more actively involved to reduce the interest rate even more. But this is a good outcome. For the next 4 or 5 years, students at all levels are going to see lower interest payments than if we do nothing. Some of my colleagues are upset. They do not like this outcome. They would like to see a much different relationship between the Federal Government and the students and their families. I would too. But I know where the votes are.

With the Republican House of Representatives, with the need for 60 votes in this Chamber, that type of reform is not likely to occur. So I urge my colleagues, when the time comes to vote on student loans and the student loan interest rate, do not leave us in a position where we keep the 6.8 percent interest rate. Let us bring it down to 3.8 percent, a more affordable rate. That is good for these students and their families. Then let's join with Senator HARKIN and Senator ALEXANDER for higher education reform, to look at the overall cost of higher education, to work with the President and find ways to reduce the cost of education and to make sure we provide the education and training our students need to compete in the 21st century.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 1744

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I now call up Vitter amendment No. 1744 to the appropriations bill currently before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. VITTER] proposes an amendment numbered 1744.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit funds to be used to provide housing assistance benefits to individuals convicted of certain felonies)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available under this Act shall be used to provide housing assistance benefits for an individual who is convicted of aggravated sexual abuse under section 2241 of title 18, United States Code, murder under section 1111 of title 18, United States Code, an offense under chapter 110 of title 18, United States Code, an offense under chapter 110 of title 18, United States Code, or any other Federal or State offense involving sexual assault, as defined in 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a)).

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I hope this is viewed universally as a commonsense, bipartisan amendment. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment through the rollcall vote which we will have. It is very simple, very basic, and I think very appropriate. It says that for the most serious crimes that exist—violent crimes, crimes against women and children, very serious crimes by anyone's definition—these will be disqualifiers for Federal housing assistance.

I bring this amendment for two simple reasons. First, I think this should go hand in hand with committing those extremely serious crimes. Again, we are not talking about threshold crimes. We are not talking about first-time drug offenses. We are talking about aggravated sexual abuse, murder, sexual exploitation of children, violence against women.

Those are the four big categories, very serious, very violent crimes. Usually, these are crimes focused on some of the most vulnerable in our society, such as children and abused women. I think it is very reasonable and common sense to say these crimes have very serious consequences. One of those—the most obvious is a stiff jail sentence, in some cases life. But one of those consequences is also going to be the Federal taxpayer is not going to give you housing or give you help for housing.

There is a second equally, maybe more, important reason to support this commonsense disqualifier. It is to protect those other folks who need and use Federal housing assistance and help clean up what historically have been areas that actually congregate violent crime in some of our worst social problems, in Federal housing projects.

I grew up in New Orleans. This has been a perennial problem in New Orleans. But I am happy and proud to say



it is a problem that has been getting better, being solved bit by bit, particularly post-Katrina. Similar to most major American cities, in the 1950s and 1960s, huge housing projects began to be built and began to grow in New Orleans. They were, unfortunately, centers of some of the worst of some of our social ills, particularly violent crime and drug abuse. And that is because we had a policy which actually congregated—and I hope that wasn't the intent—the worst of those problems in these housing projects. Of course, that fed on itself and made many of these problems even worse and certainly subjected innocent folks trapped in those housing projects to some of the worst problems of our big cities.

In New Orleans, since Katrina, we have taken significant steps to get away from that. We have instituted new policy. They are less dense—these housing projects—and there are more mixed income; not 100 percent of the folks in these projects are subsidized. It is usually a mixed approach so that there are some market based, some partially subsidized, some heavily subsidized, but less dense environments. So we have taken specific steps to try to learn from the horrible mistakes we made in Federal housing projects particularly in the 1960s and early 1970s.

This commonsense test fits in exactly with that approach, and it says we are not going to subject people in these centers of subsidized housing to the worst violence and the worst social problems we have. We are not going to congregate violent criminals, drug abusers, and others in these housing projects.

So that is the second compelling reason to support the Vitter amendment. Keep in mind the innocent folks in those housing projects who get some subsidized housing help. They deserve better. They do not deserve to be subjected to the worst of the worst, these horrible social problems that in the past we have actually congregated in public housing projects.

So, again, I hope this is viewed as it should be, as a commonsense amendment and one that deserves wide bipartisan support. I would also note it is extremely similar to an amendment that passed on the recent farm bill without controversy—the same basic rule with regard to the Food Stamp Program. So I urge all my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to support this straightforward, reasonable amendment on the rollcall vote we will, hopefully, have soon.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, first, let me commend the Senator from Louisiana for his amendment. It would restrict criminals who have been convicted of certain violent or sex crimes from receiving housing assistance through HUD's public housing choice neighborhood and tenant- and project-based section 8 programs.

Public housing authorities and private property owners who provide assistance under these programs are already required under Federal law to deny admission or assistance to individuals who are subject to lifetime registration on a sex offender registry under a State program. However, when you move to the next stage, strangely enough, it is discretionary.

Under current law, prior violent criminal activity may be grounds for the denial of assistance for public housing and the section 8 programs, but it is not required to be grounds to deny that kind of assistance. That is exactly the point that Senator VITTER is trying to make. So his amendment would tighten the current law to make it very clear that under certain categories—aggravated sexual abuse, murder, and murder in the second degree, sexual exploitation, and other abuse of children and violence against women—individuals convicted of those crimes would not qualify for public housing assistance under the programs that I have mentioned.

As Senator VITTER said, this is a commonsense amendment. It will help to make housing safer for the law-abiding citizens residing there. He has targeted serious crimes, and I think his amendment should be adopted. I am going to support the amendment, and I will be urging its adoption.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, one of the issues and questions that have been raised by many of my colleagues about this bill is that at first glance it appears to be higher than the President's budget request for these two departments—Transportation and HUD and the related agencies—and I want to explain why that is. It is a very legitimate question, but it has a very good answer.

The answer is the President's budget for the agencies and departments under our jurisdiction is artificially low because it relies on gimmicks, and it relies on scoring differences between CBO and OMB. Let me explain just a couple of areas where it will become evident to my colleagues why the difference exists and why the President's budget submission actually is not less than the bill that is on the floor now, if true budgeting principles and accounting were used.

First of all, the President's budget proposes to shift \$2 billion in existing discretionary programs to mandatory in order to appear to achieve savings, including \$1.5 billion from Amtrak's operating capital and debt service grants and \$450 million by removing

large hub airports from the Airport Improvements Program.

In addition, the President's budget request assumes an increase in the passenger facility charge at airports from \$4.50 to \$8.00. Well, we have seen this movie before. When the FAA authorization was being considered just last year, Congress rejected this fee increase. There is no reason to believe it is going to be accepted now. Yet that is built into the President's budget assumptions. We have seen him do this on a host of tax issues too, so this is not unknown for this administration.

There is another area I think is highly significant. The President's request for section 8 project-based rental assistance is insufficient to fully fund existing 12-month renewal contracts with the private property owners who participate in this program. In fact, it is about 10 percent short of the amount the administration knows is going to be needed to renew these contracts for the full 12 months of the fiscal year. That is about \$1.2 billion short. That is about half of the difference we are talking about between the President's budget request and our bill.

Surely, it is not responsible to assume that somehow we are not going to pay these private property owners who are participating in the project-based section 8 program for the full year of rental assistance. It is not going to stop after 10 months. They are not going to be evicting their tenants who are receiving the subsidy.

So true and accurate budgeting would have required the President to put \$1.2 billion into his budget request for this program.

Finally, CBO scored FHA receipts—the fees, the mortgage insurance premiums—at \$1.8 billion below OMB's score, which increased the cost of maintaining the existing level of services in our bill.

We know there are disputes between CBO and OMB all the time. In this case, I am not suggesting that it is a gimmick, as in the other two examples I have given. I am suggesting there is an honest difference of opinion. But the fact is, whether we like it or not at times, we are bound by CBO's score, and CBO's estimate of those FHA receipts—those fees, those mortgage insurance premiums—is \$1.8 billion below OMB's score. That is quite a difference.

So if you add up those gimmicks, with the Amtrak program moving from discretionary to mandatory, the assumption that Congress is all of a sudden just months later going to change its mind on the passenger facility charges and nearly double them after rejecting that idea just months ago, the failure to fully fund the project-based section 8 rental assistance, and the difference between CBO and OMB—the genuine dispute on FHA receipts—if you add all that up, it is not accurate to say our bill is \$2.4 billion above the President's request. What we employed was CBO's estimate. We got rid of the gimmicks, and we used honest

budgeting, and that accounts for the difference.

I hope my colleagues will not be misled into thinking that somehow this bill is above the President's budget request. When you apply honest accounting principles and take into account the \$1.8 billion difference between the scoring of CBO and OMB, it is obviously not different. In fact, I would argue that we are under the President's budget request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized to speak as if in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### OBAMACARE

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, this morning there was news that the President of the United States is going to engage in a series of speeches around the country to discuss the American middle class and the economy. I think that is actually a positive thing, to start to focus on that a little bit.

The America middle class is the essence of America's greatness. I have said this often before because I am a product of that working middle class—how critically different that makes us from the rest of the world. Every country has rich people, and unfortunately every country has poor people. But one of the things that distinguishes America from the rest of the world is that we have this vibrant middle class.

I have lived that in my life. My parents were working-class people and came to this country with not a lot of education or many connections, but they were able to provide for us a lifestyle where they owned a home and were able to do vacations and provided us everything we needed—not always everything we wanted, of course. But that really distinguishes this country from the rest of the world. That vibrant middle class is the essence of our economic exceptionalism.

I am glad the President is focused on the middle class, and I hope we will begin to focus on the middle class here in our conversations as well. That is why I come to the floor to speak about the middle class for a moment, because I am very concerned about the impact that the health care law—ObamaCare—is having on the middle class.

I know Republicans have been opposed to ObamaCare from the very beginning, and I understand that a lot of people out there see ObamaCare as a bill that is going to give them access to health insurance they may not have right now. But what I want people to understand from a nonpartisan basis—Republicans, Democrats, Independents, no matter whom you voted for in the last election—is that ObamaCare is not working out the way it was advertised.

What I wish to point to today is how ObamaCare is actually hurting that vibrant American middle class which the President is trying to focus on in his

speeches and which I hope we will be focused on in our policies.

Last week on Friday I traveled to central Florida. I went to a place called Gatorland, which is kind of an old Florida tourist attraction where kids have gone for a long time with their parents to see the live alligators and the shows they put on. I used that as a forum to meet with several small businesses in the region, not all tourism related. I had a chance to sit down and talk with them about their concerns about ObamaCare and, importantly, not just what it means for their businesses—and these are middle-class businesses, by the way; we are not talking about billionaires here—but also, more importantly for me, the impact that was going to have on their employees, the people who work for them, working-class, middle-class Americans who happen to live in Florida and work at these places.

First I heard from the owner of Gatorland, who pointed out that he has a little over 100 full-time employees who work for him. You can imagine who I am talking about—the people who take your tickets when you walk in, the ones who run the exhibits. These are everyday working-class people. Some of them are young people who just got married and are trying to start a family. He gives them insurance. They have insurance right now. He pays a portion of their premiums and they pay the rest, and they seem to be pretty happy with that insurance coverage. It is not perfect. They have to pay for part of it out of pocket. But it is coverage they are happy with, and through that coverage they have a relationship with their doctors.

A young couple—for example, the wife is a few months pregnant. They have been going to the same OB/GYN. They get comfortable with this doctor, and they are happy going to this doctor. Maybe it is the same doctor who helped them with their previous pregnancies or their kids' pediatrician who knows their family's history, so every time they sit with him, they don't have to reeducate him. But the point is that they are happy with their insurance and also their doctor.

But there is a problem: Health care costs and premiums are going up for this business. As they are sitting there looking into next year and beyond, their insurance companies are already telling them: Your premiums are going to go up. We can't tell you by how much, but it is going to be by at least this much.

This means the amount of money they put aside every year in Gatorland's budget to pay for health insurance for their middle-class employees is going to go up big time, so this business has to find the money from somewhere. They could just raise the price of admission. But they really can't do that. No. 1, people can't afford it. No. 2, they have some pretty significant competition nearby from Disney World and Universal Studios. So that is not really an option for them.

Their options are as follows:

They can take the insurance they are providing now for their employees and get rid of it and replace it with another insurance that is cheaper and covers less. By the way, now it is new insurance, so if those middle-class employees are happy with their doctors, their doctors may or may not be on the new plan. So you destroy that relationship as well. It will be cheaper insurance for the employer and the employee, but it will cover less. But it meets the mandate, and obviously Gatorland can continue to operate.

The second option they have is to reduce a bunch of people to under 30 hours because if they are working less than 30 hours, they don't have to offer them anything. That is a big cost savings. They don't want to do that, as proven by the fact that they are offering the coverage now, but they may have to do that.

The third option is to just pay a fine and let these people go out and find their own insurance in the exchanges. The problem with that is, No. 1, the exchanges haven't even been created yet. Even though you are supposed to be enrolled beginning October 1, they don't exist yet. So you can't even figure out what they are if you live in Florida. No. 2—the same problem—it is a new insurance company, which means you may or may not have the same doctor.

A fundamental promise of this law when it was passed was that if you are happy with your doctor, you won't have to lose that doctor. If you are happy with your insurance, you can keep it. Obviously, for about 100-some-odd people who work in central Florida, that is not true.

I also met with a young woman named Gigi Barrios. She is the owner of FCS Building Services. Basically, it is a company that provides janitors at night to come and clean your office. This is the epitome of the working class. You know who I am talking about—the people who come in after 6:00 and vacuum the carpets and clean your offices. These are her employees. She also offers them health insurance, but her health insurance premiums are going up next year big time. She is going to have to go through the exact same choices as Gatorland. So right now in central Florida there are janitors and janitorial crews who are working more than 40 hours a week, have health insurance they are happy with, have doctors they have relationships with, and they are on the verge of losing all of that because of this law and its impact.

I met with an owner of a place called Fun Spot. Fun Spot is an old Florida attraction place. After 5 years of working at Fun Spot, you get 100 percent coverage. If you work there for 5 years, they pay all of your insurance; you don't pay a penny out of pocket. But their costs are going up astronomically—higher than anybody else's who was meeting there. The same calculation is going to happen: They are going

to have to find new and cheaper insurance, which means people who have 100 percent full coverage and are happy are going to lose it—these are ticket takers and ride operators and people who clean up. These are middle class, working-class Americans. They will lose their coverage.

I can tell you, they are not going to pay 100 percent of anyone's coverage moving forward because even if they wanted to at this point—and they do want to—they can't afford it. The premiums are going up because of ObamaCare. Or they could come up with one of these newer plans that costs less money, but there is the same fundamental problem.

Now, you may say maybe this is a Florida problem. It is not. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce recently did a survey. They found that 75 percent of small businesses in America are going to have to do something like this. In their survey they found that 27 percent of small businesses are going to cut hours just to get under the 30 hours a week to avoid the health insurance mandate because they can't afford it; 24 percent of small businesses are going to hire fewer people—which is one of the problems at Fun Spot. They actually own land, and they want to expand and grow Fun Spot. They want to add more rides, more attractions, more middle-class, working-class jobs. That is not going to happen now. So 24 percent of companies are going to hire fewer people because of ObamaCare, and 23 percent of companies plan to replace full-time employees with part-time employees.

The Congressional Budget Office has found that at least 7 million people in America are going to lose the employer coverage they have right now. At least 7 million Americans will have the promise that was made to them broken. So if you have insurance, if you are happy with your insurance, you are going to lose your insurance because of ObamaCare.

Five million people will have to pay for more expensive plans because of ObamaCare. Because they make too much according to the law, they won't qualify for a subsidy to help pay for it.

It is not just businesses, by the way. This is from Florida Today:

Some part-time Brevard County workers are getting their hours cut so the county would not be forced by federal law to pay for their health insurance. . . . Brevard County Library Service Director Jeff Thompson said 37 of his department's employees have had their hours cut as a result of the health care issue.

So the library services department—this is the middle class, and they are going to lose hours.

I don't care if you are a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, whom you voted for in the last election, this is a disaster for all of us. And rather than digging in and saying, I am going to fight to the death on this law because it has my name on it, because it was my signature achievement in my first

term, I wish the President and White House were more open-minded about saying this is not working out the way we thought. This is going to hurt way too many people at a time when people are already hurting. Let's put the brakes on this or let's redo this. Let's get rid of this and start over.

But they don't seem to be focused on that. They claim to be focused on the middle class. Yet we know millions of middle-class Americans—and a few hundred whom I know now personally in Florida—are going to be dramatically hurt by this law. Yet it is full speed ahead. That is outrageous.

I think we have one last chance to stop this if the White House won't co-operate, and that is through our budgeting process. In September we are probably going to have to pass a short-term budget to move forward into the next year. A lot of my colleagues love to say they are against ObamaCare, but if you vote for a budget that pays for ObamaCare, that pays for these things I have just described, you have voted for ObamaCare.

Some will say: That is crazy. You are going to shut down the government over ObamaCare.

No. What is crazy is moving forward with this after all the problems. This is just the tip of the iceberg. I could be here 6 hours describing all the problems with ObamaCare. Moving forward on that is what is crazy. What is crazy is arguing that the only way we can move forward with a budget is if it includes ObamaCare. What is crazy is shutting down the government because the budget doesn't pay to implement this outrageous and broken system.

We need to wake up and realize what is happening. This is hurting the American middle class, and if we lose the American middle class, we lose what makes our economy different and special and unique.

So, Mr. President, as you travel around the country this week, as you come to Jacksonville, FL, on Thursday, I hope you will also explain to the American people how it is that you can justify cutting hours, cutting benefits, taking away existing health insurance and existing doctor-patient relationships from millions of working-class and middle-class Americans who are going to be hurt by this law because of your refusal and the refusal of many of your allies to consider suspending this or permanently repealing it and replacing it with something better.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

**MR. REED.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### STUDENT LOANS

**MR. REED.** Mr. President, as you well know, since you worked awfully hard

and very effectively with respect to the issue of student loans, we are about to rush into a complete restructuring of the way we price student loans. I believe this is not the appropriate approach. I think there are some fundamental issues with the student lending program that require a comprehensive approach. I have tried, along with many of my colleagues, to at least extend the 3.4 percent for a year so we can do this systematically and thoughtfully, do it in terms of not just interest rate structures but in terms of incentives to keep college costs down and also to deal with the increasingly difficult issue of the existing loan burdens that students have so they can refinance—not just in the future but families of students struggling today with a huge amount of student debt.

Student debt has exceeded \$1 trillion. It has surpassed credit card debt as the second largest household debt that we hold in the United States. In this context, I think we have to go forward and look at this comprehensively.

The bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act is a product of great effort and very sincere effort to try to deal with this problem. But I do not think it will lead to a long-term stable solution that will benefit students. What I think it will do is shift the costs of these programs increasingly to students. This is not the way it used to be.

The idea that government would generate revenue from student loan programs is a fairly recent one. From the first loan programs we established in the 1950s, the programs were designed as investments, something we paid for and we benefited from through increased productivity, through increased education of our citizens, and increased ability to compete worldwide. It was not designed to generate profits. It was not designed to break even. It was designed to invest in the future of the country through its young men and women.

We invested in education because we understood educational opportunity was directly connected to our prosperity and our security. Indeed, it was the engine that was going to pull individuals up the ranks into the middle class and beyond, and it was going to pull the country forward with increasing prosperity and increasing national benefit.

In response to Sputnik back in the 1950s we created the national defense student loan, what we now know as the Perkins loan, to expand the number of college graduates, especially in the fields of math, science, education, and engineering. Those are the very fields today where we see we need more people—math, science, engineering, and education. Today we call it STEM, a fancy term. Back then it was just math, science, engineering, and education. These were low-cost loans with very generous benefits.

For instance, no interest accrued on the loans while students were in school, and teachers could get these loans forgiven.

In the Higher Education Act of 1965, one of the principal architects was Senator Claiborne Pell, my predecessor. In that act, grants, work-study, and low-cost loans were the three pillars of student financial aid. We gave money to the students without requiring repayments with grants. We had very low cost loans relative to prevailing rates in the country, and then we had a work-study program. Providing more educational opportunity then was seen as a necessity, not a luxury, not something that would be nice to do. And we have all benefited from it.

The productivity of this country today is a direct result of those investments that were made in the 1950s and 1960s. In fact, I suggest, with very rare exceptions, every person in this body benefited. I know I did.

After West Point, which was funded by the government but required at least 5 years of service afterwards, I went to law school. I had to get a loan to help me get through, and I did. In fact, I would also daresay there is nobody in this Chamber today, with very few exceptions, who was without the access to and benefits of very generous student lending that persisted, that was part, that was a fixture of the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s, 1980s.

This notion that we need to educate our young people is even more compelling today than it was in the 1960s and the 1970s.

This is a chart, "Jobs Requiring at Least Some College Education by 2018."

In 1973, less than 30 percent of jobs required a college education. You could leave high school—if you had good work habits and good skills—and you could manage to make a living, buy a home, rise up through the ranks of managing production on the floor, and get into management if you were talented, ambitious, et cetera.

Now, you see, by 2018 you are looking at over 60 percent of the jobs, nearly two-thirds, that will require some college. Here we were heavily subsidizing college education. Now we are proposing to say: No, students have to absorb the costs. Families have to absorb the cost. This cannot be a cost to the government in terms of our budget. That logic just doesn't seem compelling to me at all.

We also know not only is college becoming more important in the sense of the jobs that need to be filled, but here is the other reality.

This is the lifetime earnings. You can see there is a huge increase in lifetime earnings with education. As we make it more difficult to go to higher education, we are basically telling people they are not going to earn as much as they could. When we are wondering today about why there is so much inequality in this country, why wages are not going up, it comes back in large part to the fact that we need higher skilled workers, better educated citizens.

As we impose more costs on students and families to go and get this master's

degree or professional degree or doctorate degree or bachelor's degree, the market will tell us the higher the cost, the fewer people will do it. We are essentially telling those people they are locked in wherever they are. They are not going to be the ones who move from that humble abode to the middle-class home and beyond.

That, I think, frankly, is one of the most disturbing aspects that people are facing all across this country, the realization and the fear that their children will not do better than they did. Our parents, all of them, I think, could say with great confidence: I am working hard, I am struggling, but I know my children will do better.

One of the reasons our constituents across this country are saying we are not getting it right is this growing perception and feeling that, no, their children will not do better. By the way, this vote speaks volumes about our commitment to making sure the next generation of Americans does better.

Just look at the numbers. This is how you get well compensated in the United States. Our country is based upon the notion that education is the engine that will pull you forward. That is the way we are going to deal with this notion of inequality of income. That is the American solution. Again, I think as we depart from this tradition we are going to find ourselves in an increasingly difficult situation.

We are essentially asking in the proposal that is before us for low- and middle-income students to assume more of the cost of higher education—and their parents. Some can, but they will have less to invest in other things. Some cannot, and they will miss this train, literally.

Even though in constant dollars the maximum Pell grant—we are still providing grants—is nearly where it was in terms of the 1970s, it is paying for a much lower percentage of the cost of higher education. I think that is an important point to note.

This is not just about the level of Federal support. That is why I have urged us to stop and look at a comprehensive approach. What is happening—these are the Pell grants indicating how they went up dramatically in the 1970s and then tapered off and then finally, based upon President Obama's initiative, I believe, in 2009, they went up again based upon our changing from bank-based lending to a direct lending program. We shifted resources to the Pell grants. The Pell grants have been going up.

What has also been going up is tuition. So when we are talking about the road to opportunity, when we are talking about dealing with this program comprehensively, just simply restructuring rates is not going to get it because this is what we are looking at: average tuition and fees at public and private universities. The green line is the 4-year private. That is shooting up out of sight. But we also know, and this might be anecdotal, those are the

schools, the elite schools, if you will, that in many cases provide even an express road to opportunity for so many people. That is why they are so competitive to get into. Those costs are rocketing out of sight.

But just the 4-year public colleges, which used to be the backbone of our whole country where with a modest fee you could get a great education, they are going up. We know from testimony that has been recorded here, a lot of it is because, as we are pulling back from supporting students and their families, guess what, States are doing the same thing.

We had years and years of reduced budgets to our university system which have been reversed in only the last few years by the present Governor. We are pulling back. What happens as a result of that? Tuition goes up.

When we look back to the mid-1970s, if a student got a Pell grant, that student could cover most of the cost of a 4-year education at a State school. Students cannot do that now. What does that mean? They have to borrow. Students have to borrow if they are in a situation where they are relatively low income, very low income, or of modest means.

The consequence of this has resulted in an explosion of borrowing. This is the total FFEL—that is the old name for the lending program—and DL, the direct lending program that is used today for Stafford loans. These are the loan amounts from 1966. At the bottom here, it is very small. It is off the chart. Through the 1970s, it was rather constant. It started to spike up here.

Here is the curve. There is a little bit of a downward spike here, but that might be because people are dropping out. They cannot afford to borrow. I am hearing stories—and my colleagues are hearing stories—of people leaving school. They are saying: What is in it for me? I can't afford to graduate from college with a \$25,000 or \$50,000 debt and then get a job—or maybe not get a job—that is paying \$35,000 a year. I will never get out of that hole.

There has been an extraordinary explosion of lending. As lending has grown, there is more of a need to take steps to curtail the lending or to help students deal with this lending. There is over \$1 trillion in outstanding Federal student loan debt that young people are going to have to somehow amortize and pay off through their lifetime.

We have already had studies from the Federal Reserve and leading authorities who say this will delay home acquisition and all the things we thought would happen almost automatically or routinely in this country. A student goes to college, graduates, and then by their late twenties they have done enough in their job to buy a home, start a family, and become a pillar of the middle class. That hope and dream is receding.

There is another aspect of this that gets into the whole accounting issue

we have to deal with. CBO looked at these issues and scored them. They indicated that between 2013 and 2023—and that is over the next 10 years—we will generate about \$184 billion worth of profit for the Federal Government. It is the difference between what the students are paying us back and what we are using to borrow. It is essentially the difference between our costs and their repayment to us. This is a remarkable shift from investing in students throughout all of these decades—post-World War II—to now essentially being able to generate income from students.

Since 2007, we have been seeing a positive return to the Federal Government on student loans—even from loans made under the old bank-based system—because of the way the interest rates have run, because of our borrowing costs, and because of the costs students have to pay.

Given the fact we are able to generate \$184 billion over 10 years, I think we should be able to find our way through to a 3.4-percent rate for at least another year, but that has proven elusive in terms of the votes on the floor.

I think all of this strongly suggests we have a major challenge to reconfigure our student lending system, our grant system, and our work-study system. We have a major challenge in lowering the cost of a college education. Rather than taking off like a rocket, the costs should be coming down. We cannot do that in a matter of 2 or 3 days. It is going to take some comprehensive and coherent work over many weeks and months.

The problem we face in terms of looking forward and making changes is we have locked the interest rate at 6.8 percent under our budget rules. As a result, everything we do has to rotate around 6.8 percent.

The proposals by my colleagues would lower interest rates in the first few years. However, in order to make up for the 6.8-percent assumption in the budget, it would have to raise interest rates in the out-years. For the first several years we are going to provide an increasingly expensive but starting relatively inexpensive—approach to student borrowing. But that has to be made up arithmetically by a higher cost for those succeeding generations.

For example, if you are a senior in high school today, you will do reasonably well—not as well as 3.4 percent, but reasonably well. If you have a younger sibling who is in eighth or ninth grade, he or she will pay for you because those rates—just to make up the gap—will be much higher. We know it will be higher.

I must commend the authors of the legislation who have at least put in a cap for the various lending programs. Originally, as this proposal made its way through the Senate, there were no caps, so rates could have soared to astronomical heights. Still, even with

the caps, over the long term the succeeding generations of students—and this is a long-term proposal and not a proposal that has a finite period of time—will have rates that will go up and up and up.

The key aspect that is driving all of this is the assumption that we should not be investing in higher education, as we have for decades, and that we have to have a budget-neutral solution. Rather than saying we can go ahead and do things, such as close tax loopholes, let's move that money into higher education, which I would argue would be beneficial for everyone in the short and long run.

We have been locked into this budget-neutral approach, and there is a \$715 million surplus, but it is as close to zero, as far as budget neutrality, as they could get.

I go back to the point of revenue neutral, which means that given the present law of a fixed rate of 6.8 percent for undergraduate loans, 7.9 percent for other loans, we are going to enjoy it now and pay later. That is the essence of the proposal before us. Students could pay much more later.

I also think the idea that we are going to fix this 2 years or 3 years hence is not reasonable because the cost of fixing it goes up with each year. If our principle and our presumption is that it always has to be revenue neutral, there might be some good ideas about fixing it, but where is the money? That is what is going to have to be included to fix it.

I think we can do better. I will be offering an amendment with Senator WARREN which will cap this proposal at 6.8 percent for student loans and 7.9 percent for the PLUS family loan—the parent loan—that will be comparable to what the fixed loan rates are today. This way we can at least tell all of our constituents: No student will be worse off—not just over 3 or 4 years—over the next 10 to 20 years, or however long this legislation endures. I think that is something that would be a useful improvement.

We are paying for it by a surcharge for people who are making over \$1 million. It is a very small surcharge. We should be able to say: We can find the resources to invest in the future of the country and to support and subsidize students so they can improve their skills, move into the middle class, and move the country forward. We have always done it. We can do it today.

I urge my colleagues to favorably consider the amendment when it is proposed.

Again, there have been extraordinary efforts on the part of many—principled and thoughtful—to try to deal with this issue. I go back to my initial point: If we want to deal with it, we have to have time, and, frankly, we have to have resources. The way this is evolving, we don't have time and we are unwilling, it appears at this juncture, to commit significant resources to solve this problem in a comprehen-

sive and coherent way that will benefit students and families and in the long run will benefit this country.

With that, I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 4:45 p.m. be equally divided between Senators VITTER and MURRAY or their designees for debate on Vitter amendment No. 1744; that at 4:45 p.m., the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Vitter amendment; further, that no second-degree amendment be in order to the Vitter amendment prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1744, offered by the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. VITTER.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 182 Leg.]

#### YEAS—99

Alexander	Corker	Johanns
Ayotte	Cornyn	Johnson (SD)
Baldwin	Crapo	Johnson (WI)
Barrasso	Cruz	Kaine
Baucus	Donnelly	King
Begich	Durbin	Kirk
Bennet	Enzi	Klobuchar
Blumenthal	Feinstein	Landrieu
Blunt	Fischer	Leahy
Boozman	Flake	Lee
Boxer	Franken	Levin
Brown	Gillibrand	Manchin
Burr	Graham	Markey
Cantwell	Grassley	McCain
Cardin	Hagan	McCaskill
Carper	Harkin	McConnell
Casey	Hatch	Menendez
Chambliss	Heinrich	Merkley
Chiesa	Heitkamp	Mikulski
Coats	Heller	Moran
Coburn	Hirono	Murkowski
Cochran	Hoeven	Murphy
Collins	Inhofe	Murray
Coons	Isakson	Nelson

Paul  
Portman  
Pryor  
Reed  
Reid  
Risch  
Roberts  
Rubio  
Sanders

Schatz  
Schumer  
Scott  
Sessions  
Shaheen  
Shelby  
Stabenow  
Tester  
Thune

Toomey  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Vitter  
Warner  
Warren  
Whitehouse  
Wicker  
Wyden

# NAYS—1

Rockefeller

The amendment (No. 1744) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Ms. COLLINS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

## ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, that when the Senate resumes consideration of S. 1243 on Wednesday, July 24, Senator PORTMAN be recognized to call up his amendment, No. 1749.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, there will be no further rollcall votes tonight. I know there are several Senators who wish to speak tonight. We will begin again tomorrow with Senator PORTMAN's amendment. I ask all Senators who do have amendments on the bill to get them ready. Senator COLLINS and I are ready, open for business. We want to move this along, and we are ready to go. Please don't wait until the last minute Thursday night. Get your amendments in tomorrow. You will have a much better chance of having them considered. I speak for myself, and I am sure I speak for Senator COLLINS too. We are much happier to work with you earlier in the process than later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I want to second what the chair of our subcommittee, the Senator from Washington, said. Frankly, we could have done 10 amendments today in the time that we were on the floor, ready to work through amendments. I know there are many amendments out there. I encourage our colleagues on both sides of the aisle not to wait until the eleventh hour. It is going to be much harder for us to work to accommodate amendments at that point.

Tomorrow is the opportunity for people to come to the floor early. We will be here ready to work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is so warned.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## MORNING BUSINESS

### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, upon the completion of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent my colleagues, Senator BLUMENTHAL from Connecticut and Senator BROWN from Ohio, be recognized to speak after me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## STUDENT LOANS

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, we are talking about student loans. The thing I have found out working this in the amount of time we have been working it is we are all in the same position. We all want to help our students attain higher education, to be productive citizens, to live a better quality of life. We all know that is the most important thing we can do, and we are trying the best we possibly can to come up with a solution.

We have what we call a bipartisan bill that we have all worked on. We have everyone's input. I respect everyone's position, and we are going to come to a comprehensive bill. I think under Senator HARKIN from Iowa we will have a comprehensive bill that looks at why the costs are so high and why college is so unattainable for so many families today. We have to tackle that problem.

The problem before us now is this problem: How do we help the most? What we have before us is 6.8 percent if we do nothing, 6.8 percent across. I know some people have said it is better if the 6.8 stays as it is. I disagree.

We have been working on this. Here is the difference. The 6.8 percent that is basically the cap right now—the old cap we had was 3.4 percent just for the subsidized. If we look at the portion of people who are subsidized, it is less than 1 million. If we look at the unsubsidized, it is less than 1 million. If we look at basically the subsidized and unsubsidized, that is more than 6.5 million. Our bill basically reduces that 6.8 rate down to 3.86 for this coming year. Rather than leaving it at 6.85, we have helped this many people who are basically needing this money in order to go to school. If we left it as it is, they would be paying the 6.8. If we only kept the 3.4, the subsidized loan, this is the amount of people we would be helping.

So we come as a bipartisan group saying: How can we help the most? I think most of us agree with that. As we look further down these charts, we have also asked: Under current law, how much would the average dependent undergraduate repay? Under the bipartisan bill, we can see 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, which we have scored out, it

would be about at 3.86, 4.62, 5.4, and 6.2. At 6.8 across the board, if it would stay, there is a difference of savings of over \$2,000. That we know.

The other argument that has been used and the point that has been made is rates might go up. Yes, rates might go up. If they do go up, how much would you pay? This is worst case scenario. The bipartisan bill, over the 10-year period, and current law if it stayed fixed over 10 years, it is a very small possibility it would go up, and that would be a \$505 difference. The bottom line is we know this is a fact. This has been scored and that is where these rates are going to stay. They think that might be the worst-case scenario.

Let me show the difference of what has happened. CBO has not had the greatest track record with scoring. In 2003, we were a little over 4 percent. They projected interest rates for 10 years out. If we look at what they are projecting out for 10 years, it has about the same path as far as what actually happened under the rates. There is a big spread of money that would have been spent based on fixing the rate, let's say back in 2003, versus what was actually occurring. We are hoping we are able to continue that savings.

We understand that what we are dealing with is an awful lot of help and safeguards that are built in for young students. The best safeguard we have built in is the IBR, income-based repayment. The IBR Program allows the student who has graduated with an exorbitant amount of debt—and finds a job that basically doesn't give them the type of money they would like—a cap on how much of their disposable income can be paid toward the loan. The cap is at 15 percent now, I believe, and is going to go to 10 percent. It is also based on the amount of years. After 20 years, they are done paying. If their income did not increase appreciably, they are only going to pay the loan back based on their income of 10 percent—10 percent of their disposable income. We think that is a tremendous savings.

Most students who qualify for the subsidized loan get the Pell grant. They don't have to pay that back. As far as the subsidized loans, basically the taxpayers have invested in the students who qualify for those for the first 4 years of college, and that interest is not accrued. The interest does not accrue until they leave. Those are the things that have been built in that we think give the protections we want.

If we do nothing, we save the students about \$8 billion over 2013 compared to \$31 billion if we do something. If we are able to help this many students, that is equivalent to a \$23 billion difference in savings, and that has been scored.

I know we have talked about the accounting procedure. I know the Presiding Officer has worked very hard on this and understands it very well. I agree with you—if we could take every



penny of profit out and make sure the students were getting the absolute lowest rate. I also know that basically market-driven rates—if we are going to go to market, which we are in this piece of legislation—and we look at the risk factors, defaults, and all that goes into that and score that normally under a market-risk value or market value, it would be different. They have shown that market value would be \$95 billion we will be losing and that the taxpayers would be subsidizing. The way we are doing it now shows a profit of \$184 billion.

I am willing to work with the Presiding Officer to clear this up and get something more accurate of how we score and how we charge students. That is not what we have in front of us, and I think that is the difference. We are trying to move forward to get some certainty.

We have a lot of students in West Virginia who are deciding whether they can go to college and, if they can, where do they go and what can they afford. This gives them the certainty I think they have been looking for and hopefully the certainty they definitely need. There are more than 8½ million undergraduate students who take advantage of the Stafford Loan Program every year and over 6.5 million of these students take both the subsidized and unsubsidized loans and that is a big change.

Our colleagues on the other side, as we have been negotiating this, we talked to them about how we didn't want any profits whatsoever, and they agreed. The first bill that came from the House had \$16 billion on top of what the base was at \$184 billion. That has been taken out the best we possibly could to \$700 million.

When you think about how we are going to run a deficit this year of \$740 billion just in our annual budgeting here in Washington—and we are talking about \$714 billion over a 10-year period with over \$1 trillion. They said that is as close as they were able to come. Even if there is any of that, we are looking at—with this amendment Senator HARKIN was able to put in—how we are able to see if that can be funneled back in and reduce the loans even further.

I think we are doing everything we possibly can. There is going to be about \$1.4 trillion in loans offered over the next decade. We pretty much know that. There is \$140 billion of loans every year. As a matter of fact, student loans are now the second largest indebtedness we are carrying. It is the largest burden we are carrying next to a mortgage. It just surpassed credit cards. It is unbelievable. We have to get a handle on the cost of college.

Current students and graduates are holding at \$1.1 trillion in loans. The loans represent investments and will pay dividends in the form of higher earnings. The best investment a youth is going to make is an education, but if it becomes unobtainable, inaccessible,

and unaffordable, it does them no good. We know that, and that is the balance we are trying to find.

The average student loan debt—every one of these young students, when they get done with college—for those who graduated in 2011 is about \$26,000 that everyone is leaving college with, on average, for a debt. There is only a small percentage of borrowers who have small loan balances, but 11 percent, or roughly 4 million people, owe \$50,000 or more. It is truly unbelievable.

I have heard everyone here give their reasoning for this, such as not having had good consultation, good advice or good fiscal planning, and that may be true. We can do much better to make sure the students are not taking loans that they can do without or maybe not take too much out.

I appreciate the hard work and good faith that all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle have been showing to reach this compromise. I know it is not easy for many, and I know everybody is going to have, hopefully, their say and their vote on an amendment or two if they wish to.

At the end of the day, I believe we can walk away knowing we did better today than doing nothing at all. I believe that. I believe I, the Presiding Officer, and all of our other colleagues are going to come back and work hard whether it is the remainder of this year or next year. Basically, we are going to get a program so that these young people can find college attainable again and affordable. That is what we have all been working on.

The plan helps everyone and not just some. It lowers rates 100 percent for all students. So everything we have in our compromised bill brings down those rates. It provides a long-term fix. We don't have to kick the can down the road. We know it is there. If we can find something better between now and 4 years, 3 years, 2 years or even before this year is up, then we are willing to go back and entertain that. We don't want to see loans that were supposed to help students move forward end up moving them back.

I know what debt does; it will smother. My grandfather used to say: Indebtedness will make a coward out of you in the decisions you make when you are carrying so much debt. You will be robbing Peter to pay Paul just to survive.

We have found ourselves with the sequester, and with everything else going on, we ask how we are going to make it. When you find yourself against a proverbial rock, if you will, you will do things you would never do normally.

We are trying to find a way to move forward. It shows our students that the country believes in them and that we support their efforts to advance their education and reach for the American dream.

When we, as Democrats, Republicans, and Independents, work together and have a real debate on a real problem—and this has been debated—we can

come up with commonsense solutions that truly benefit all Americans. I believe we have done that. It is refreshing for such an important issue we have. We have put politics aside in the first and foremost thing we want to do—help the students. It doesn't matter whether we are talking about a Republican, Democrat or Independent, everybody had the same purpose. I thought it was refreshing to see that. We want to lower the rates for everybody. We want to help everybody, give them some certainty and make it affordable. I look forward to working in this more bipartisan atmosphere we have right now on many more subjects. I know we can when we put our country first. The right thing to do is to put our country first.

We might be a "D" as a Democrat or we might be an "R" as a Republican, but we are always an "A" first, which is an American.

With that, I think the students have been served. I think we will be able to give them consistency. This piece of legislation has been worked on hard. There has been a lot of input, and Senator HARKIN did a yeoman's job on bringing some of the most important factors we had to the forefront and into the bill.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, while my colleague from West Virginia is here, I wish to thank him for his leadership on this issue and for the very hard work he and other colleagues have devoted to this profoundly difficult, challenging but important issue.

I rise with regret to oppose the compromise agreement that has been reached with the help of our colleagues from Illinois and Maine and across the aisle. It is a compromise, and compromises are to be sought in this day and it is bipartisan and that, too, is an objective. It is a bipartisan compromise, but the fact is, it is a bad deal.

We can do better. We must do better. This Nation can do better. We have a moral and historic obligation to do better for the students of today and their brothers and sisters who will be following them over the next 10 years.

This deal offers the illusion of lower rates in the short term while delivering higher rates, in some cases, in as little as 2 years from now. It forces students back into a system of market-based loans that have failed in the past and will fail in the future. It subjects students to economic uncertainties which are wholly unrelated to the actual cost of higher education.

We know we need to reduce the cost of tuition and higher education. We know we need to address the overwhelming \$1 trillion-plus of debt that exists from past loans. This deal exacerbates the problem instead of easing the problem.

Yes, it has caps on the interest rates students may pay, but they creep to

more than double where student loan rates were at the beginning of this month. It has a low rate, but it is, in effect, a teaser rate. As the Presiding Officer said so well, it is a teaser rate that has nowhere to go but up. It lowers the deficit, yes, but it does so by having the Federal Government reach into the pockets of students and take billions more on top of the \$51 billion already extracted in this fiscal year from them and from their hard-working parents.

At the heart of this bill is a mistaken premise. It is the premise that it is OK to profit off the backs of students and that it is all right to regard students as a revenue source or a profit center. That premise reverses a historic promise, which is: We will invest in students, not profit from them. We will support their efforts to gain higher education so they can better themselves and better the country with the skills and education they acquired. We are not supposed to hamper or handicap them and exact from them a crushing burden of debt in the future. That premise reverses a historic promise, and we cannot allow it to go forward without a fight.

Every dollar we extract from those students is a dollar they can't spend on a down payment for a house, a car, a business or an investment. These young people are the economic drivers of our future. Let's be purely selfish about it. How can they build a family, buy a home, start a business if they are hit with an 8-percent interest rate or higher at a time when we can make it more affordable? It makes no sense.

I have spoken to students across the State of Connecticut over these past weeks, and they have done the math. They know the results. As many as 86,000 students who attend our colleges and universities—and I have spoken to many of them, their families, the staff and teachers who are also doing this math—and they know the best way to reduce our deficit is not to profit from students but to make possible their higher education so they can bring their innovation and experience and expertise to the marketplace, and not make the marketplace dictate the variable rates they are charged, but enable them to contribute to the marketplace and the American dream by going to college.

IS understand the temptation of this deal, but we must reject a compromise that saves the American dream for one sibling in a family by taking away from another. My colleague from Rhode Island made this point very eloquently earlier today. If a person is a student in high school right now, they will do pretty well under this bill when they begin college next year, but not their younger brother and sister. The sister will be paying for the current student. The brother will be paying more and, in fact, may be denied the opportunity the present student has next year because the parents cannot afford to send him to college.

The issue of loan rates is complicated, but the math is pretty simple. There is already more than \$1 trillion of crushing loan debt that this bill is not refinancing. The bill provides no debt forgiveness, just market rates that will lead to higher payments and more student debt as we zoom past that \$1 trillion mark and raise it even further. The irony here is that the majority of this body has already voted to return to 3.4 percent. This compromise betrays the majority will of the Senate. Instead, it allows rates to rise as high as 8.25 percent, graduate Stafford rates as high as 9.5 percent, and PLUS rates as high as 10.5 percent. So we are saying to parents of two children: You can send one to college now with a loan that you take out at current rates, but to pay for that second child, you are going to be seeing rates more than twice as high.

Do my colleagues think the income of the average middle-class American family is going up 10.5 percent? Ask the American people. Do as I have done. Go around to the States and ask the students and the parents.

Let's not kid ourselves. The fact is they are not going to be able to pay. This compromise relies on a presumption that somehow, over the next 2 years, we are going to come back and revisit, revise, reshape, and avert disaster. I have only been here 2½ years, but what I have seen is it is better to know what the result is going to be than engage in potential false hope and raise the potential false expectation that somehow everything will be solved next year or the year after, before disaster strikes. We should learn something from our experience with sequestration.

This bill is not based on analysis of what the rate needs to be to cover the program's cost. In fact, it requests the GAO to examine and report on what that should be. So I implore my colleagues, instead of voting first and getting the facts later, that we reserve such a life-changing decision until the GAO has advised us on the cost of student loans and we use that necessary information to set the rates going forward.

There are amendments that I believe will improve this bill, and I have cosponsored them, including an amendment Senator REED and the Presiding Officer, Senator WARREN, have offered that would lower the interest rate caps in this bill to the current statutory rate. If this amendment is adopted, we can go back to the people of our States and say: At worst, you will be no worse off than under current law. We cannot say as much under this compromise bill.

I have also cosponsored the Sanders amendment which would sunset this legislation after 2 years. If interest rates rise the way they are projected to do, we could be looking at dramatically higher rates within 3 years. So this sunset clause will force us to come back and revisit them.

I have also filed my own amendment that would expand and make more generous loan repayment assistance programs for borrowers who are struggling right now to make payments under existing law. At a time when outstanding student debt is \$1.2 trillion, we need to make sure we help and support distressed borrowers at every stage of repayment, and that is the unaddressed need this body needs to confront.

I am hopeful these amendments will be adopted. In the meantime, I must respectfully and regretfully oppose this compromise. We are the greatest Nation in the history of the world, as we are fond of saying repeatedly on the floor of this body. But only one thing is certain about the Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act, and that is rates will inexorably, inevitably, inexcusably go up. They will exceed current rates. We must stand and fight to prevent that kind of betrayal of the fundamental American promise of higher education and the American dream.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

#### BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, most of my colleagues might look at these pictures and think they depict facilities owned by ExxonMobil or BP, but this is, amazingly enough, a picture of Morgan Stanley. Morgan Stanley, to most Americans and most people in this Chamber, if they know of it, is a bank. Morgan Stanley used to be an investment bank and now it is just considered a bank. Let me explain.

Morgan Stanley owns a company called TransMontaigne, a petroleum and chemical transportation and storage company, and Heidmar Inc., which reportedly manages more than 100 oil tankers—tankers that look like this.

Today I held a banking subcommittee hearing, which the Presiding Officer attended, as did Senator MERKLEY and Senator TOOMEY, to examine how the line between banks and commercial enterprises is blurring. Increasingly, these large institutions combine banks and trading firms and energy suppliers and oil refiners and warehouses, as well as shipping firms and oil tankers and mining companies.

Federally insured bank holding companies, once in the business of providing checking and savings accounts to workers or loans to small businesses, are now also in the business of owning physical commodities, including aluminum, oil, and electricity. Witnesses testified at the subcommittee hearing that these risky Wall Street practices are artificially inflating prices for manufacturers and consumers. Morgan Stanley and JPMorgan Chase and Goldman Sachs take their cut when we fill up our tanks, take their cut when we buy a Coke or buy a beer in an aluminum can. They take their cut increasingly in the copper

market, a metal that is in all kinds of industrial products.

A recent article in the New York Times said:

The maneuvering in markets for oil, wheat, cotton, coffee and more have brought billions in profits to investment banks like Goldman, JPMorgan Chase Morgan Stanley, while forcing customers to pay more every time they fill up a gas tank, flick on a light switch, open a beer or buy a cell phone.

For years, our Nation separated banking from traditional commerce. But about 13, 14 years ago, after years of eroding that protection, Congress finally tore down what was left of that wall. Beyond just combining commercial banking with insurance and investment banking, banks are now allowed to trade in commodities and to engage in a variety of nonfinancial activities. Four years later, after that 1999 repeal, the Federal Reserve enabled the first financial holding company to trade in physical commodities.

The justification for this is a familiar one: Other companies were doing it, they told us, and banks were at a competitive disadvantage. Over the next 6 years, the rules unraveled, becoming looser and looser, until the loopholes were big enough for these six megabanks—now \$600 billion in assets, up to \$2.3 trillion in assets—the loopholes are big enough for these six megabanks to jump through.

The expansion of our financial system in traditional areas of commerce—from crude oil to natural gas to mining and shipping—hasn't happened in a vacuum. It has been accompanied by a host of anticompetitive activities. These activities threaten consumers. They threaten American businesses that rely upon efficient markets and arm's-length transactions. They especially threaten American manufacturing when they buy and sell and manage and transport and store metals.

From speculation in the oil and gas markets to inflated prices for aluminum to energy manipulation—we know the role of banks has expanded. Banks have expanded far beyond their traditional roles.

There has been little public awareness of or debate about the massive expansion of our largest financial institutions into new areas of the economy. That is, in part, because regulators have been less than transparent about basic facts. We can't get the information from the Federal Reserve. Whether a person is a citizen or a reporter or a Senator sitting on the Banking Committee, we can't get from the Federal Reserve the information we need to know about the governance and these rules about commodity trading by the banks. It is also because these institutions are so complex and so dense and so opaque and so impossible for people to understand that we simply can't figure out what we need to figure out.

The six largest U.S. bank holding companies have 14,000 subsidiaries. The six largest U.S. bank holding compa-

nies have 14,000 subsidiaries. Fewer than 20 of those 14,000 are the end of our traditional banks.

There are three important issues here that concern me—that Morgan Stanley can own refineries and can own the ships. Three important issues concern me, whether it is Morgan Stanley, whether it is Goldman Sachs, or whether it is JPMorgan Chase, for aluminum, copper, electricity, or oil.

The lessons of this hearing were three. No. 1, these institutions can control physical goods and financial contracts based upon those goods, meaning they know more about the trading of these goods because they store the aluminum in two dozen warehouses in Detroit or because they are moving the oil in these tankers. They know more about transactions, they know more about price, they know more about movement of goods, so that means they can trade on inside information and it gives them an advantage in proprietary trading. It means they can manipulate markets.

No. 2, these institutions—these banks that own the oil tankers and own the refineries—have access to cheap funding—cheaper funding from the Federal Reserve—that means us, as taxpayers—that they can use to finance their commodities activities. I will say that again. Because they can go to the window, they can get cheaper financing. These banks can get cheaper financing.

They say there is a wall between their traditional bank activities and what they are doing while owning these commodities and buying and selling and transporting and storing and gaming the markets, but they can get money cheaper from taxpayers. They can borrow money at a less expensive rate than anybody else, they and their competitors who also might own oil tankers or refineries.

No. 3, they are exposing themselves and us—the economy—to risks that can threaten our financial system. Just imagine the economic, the environmental, and the reputational impact to a megabank of an Exxon Valdez or a BP oilspill. Think of the economic impact that could have on the stability of the bank and the success of the bank and, therefore, the stability of the whole financial system.

Today was the first of what I expect to be several hearings on this issue. Taxpayers have a right to know what is happening. American citizens have a say in our financial system because taxpayers are the ones who will be asked to rescue these megabanks yet again if the unthinkable—which almost inevitably happens in this world over time—if the unthinkable happens.

#### NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, in 1935 Senator Robert Wagner of New York introduced the National Labor Relations Act. Also known as the Wagner Act, this bill would prove to be one

of the most important pieces of legislation in our Nation's history. This desk at which I sit was used by Senator Hugo Black of Alabama, who was Franklin Roosevelt's favorite southern Senator, they said, who later became a member of the Supreme Court. Senator Black sat at this desk and helped draft legislation with the National Labor Relations Act. In fact, he did some of the early work on what would be the Fair Labor Standards Act. What he proposed as a 30-hour workweek later helped Senator Wagner pave the way for the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Before President Roosevelt signed the National Labor Relations Act into law, American workers were routinely harassed and fired for organizing unions. American workers were often intimidated and prevented from bargaining collectively. The Wagner Act changed that. One year after its passage in 1936, this law gave rubber workers in Akron, OH, the legal tools needed to protect against poor working conditions and to protest the conditions under which they were working. The bill authorized an independent Federal agency consisting of Presidential appointees confirmed by the Senate.

The National Labor Relations Board protects American workers. It protects union members and private sector employees without a union card—both—to work together to improve their wages or working conditions. Today, the NLRB is needed perhaps more than ever.

Let me tell you a story real quickly, Madam President. A few years ago I was in Cincinnati at a dinner, and sitting at the table in front of me were six or seven middle-aged women—half White, half minority, perhaps.

They had just signed their first union contract with the Service Employees International Union. These five or six women were the negotiators on behalf of 1,200 janitors negotiating with the downtown Cincinnati business owners. There was an empty seat at the table, so I went and sat down.

I said: What does having this union mean to you?

They had just signed the contract that day.

One woman said: I am 51 years old. This is the first time in my life I have ever had a paid 1-week vacation.

Think about the number of Americans who do not have a paid 1-week vacation. For people in jobs that dress like me, for the pages sitting here, most of their parents, I imagine, are used to working in a place where they get a 1- or 2- or 3-week paid vacation. Much of America does not. That is just one of the things a union has brought to this country—giving people those opportunities.

The reason I say the NLRB is needed perhaps now more than ever is that in 2013 State legislatures are curbing collective bargaining rights. Two years ago in Ohio, the State legislature and Governor Kasich took away collective bargaining rights for all intents and

purposes for public-employee workers. The voters of Ohio said no to that, and 61 percent of them struck that law down in a referendum. But nonetheless the antiunion efforts from the most pro-corporate, conservative, far-right State legislators in State legislatures across the country continue unabated.

Workers are still being punished for discussing pay and bonuses with one another.

For 78 years the NLRB has been instrumental in addressing the challenges American workers faced. Senator Wagner explained on the floor:

It is necessary to insure a wise distribution of wealth between management and labor, to maintain a full flow of purchasing power, and to prevent recurrent depressions.

We know that when workers make decent wages, workers buy the cars made in this country, they buy the appliances, they go to the hardware store, they pay their property taxes, they buy homes, they renovate their homes, they do things that put money into the economy. If you only have a sliver of people who are very wealthy and a declining middle class, the purchasing power and the growth in the economy tends to diminish. That is not the kind of country we want, and it is not the kind of country we have had since World War II. But just a few years after the great recession, there is a widening gap between the average wage of workers and heads of corporations.

For families struggling to make ends meet after a breadwinner was unfairly forced off the assembly line, the NLRB matters.

If we do not confirm the President's nominees, then workers, such as Kevin from Akron, will have no recourse against retaliation for his union activity. Kevin and his coworkers wanted to form a union to stop a 12-hour shift policy from being put in place at their place of employment. The company fired six workers, including Kevin, for this union activity.

While the NLRB ordered the company to reinstate the workers—the NLRB said the company was wrong; under Federal law, the workers should be reinstated—the DC Circuit Court—in large part, with judges who almost always do the bidding of the wealthiest corporations in this country—the DC Circuit Court delayed enforcement of the case until the pending challenge to the President's 2012 nominees is resolved in court or the board has a Senate-confirmed quorum.

Kevin is a human face of why America needs a fully staffed National Labor Relations Board with the legal quorum needed to do its job. We should confirm these board members. We should make sure workers such as Kevin receive the workplace protections—whether they are union members, whether they are not union members—they deserve.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THUD APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise today to talk about legislation we are currently considering, and it is a welcome development that we are actually working on appropriations bills on the Senate floor. I want to commend the work of Chairwoman MIKULSKI of the Appropriations Committee, her ranking member Senator SHELBY, as well as both Chairman MURRAY and Ranking Member COLLINS on the so-called THUD bill. Everything in Washington has an acronym. So it is with this, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill.

As many people know, when you consider those appropriations and you consider the subject matter, it is pretty broad and diverse. I will just give maybe a five-part summation here of what we are talking about. It means investing, of course, in transportation infrastructure; providing housing and services to very vulnerable Americans; supporting our communities and addressing the foreclosure crisis, which is still with us in so many ways, as the Presiding Officer knows so well and has worked so hard on over many years; ensuring the safety of our transportation system; and then, No. 5, promoting sustainability in our communities.

I want to talk first about Amtrak. Amtrak is part of our transportation infrastructure that not only is critically important for a State such as Pennsylvania but really the entire eastern seaboard and really across the whole country. It is one of the reasons we can move not just people but goods and services with the transactions that occur when people are able to get from one place to another.

The Senate bill we are considering includes almost \$1.5 billion for Amtrak, preserving the Federal commitments to provide safe, reliable, and energy-efficient passenger rail transportation for more than 31 million travelers—and that is an annual number—plus an additional 235 million commuter trips that depend upon Amtrak and its infrastructure along the Northeast corridor.

Unfortunately, the House bill guts funding for Amtrak, cutting the appropriation by a third—\$465 million below the fiscal year 2013 enacted level. This is the lowest level of funding in over a decade. It makes no sense in a lot of ways to try to find savings in a bill like this at such an extreme level. It makes no sense at all in terms of our economy.

Due to contract and debt service payment commitments, this would mean Amtrak only has \$100 million for capital investments. The Northeast cor-

ridor alone needs \$782 million per year to address longstanding state of good repair projects, so not even one-seventh of the dollars we need for state of good repair projects. This is not just a nice thing to do every year. You have to fix the infrastructure if you are running a transportation system and especially if you are running Amtrak.

So that is not only a safety issue, but it is a jobs issue. You could put at risk some 10,000 jobs and possibly eliminate some existing Amtrak routes.

In 2012 over 6.1 million Amtrak passengers traveled at Pennsylvania stations, and this number is expected to increase in 2013. Ridership has continued to grow over the past several years. It reached an alltime high last year and is on track to break that record in 2013.

I was just talking to folks at Amtrak today, and they talked about the tremendous growth in ridership. That is good for a lot of reasons. It is not just nice for Amtrak. Most importantly, it is good for our environment, with fewer people driving cars that have an impact on air emissions. It is also probably a great stress-reliever for people. Driving and working is a challenge, getting from one place to another. Riding on a train can allow you to do work and maybe allow you to be more rested, and it probably cuts down on traffic fatalities, although I do not have a study that backs that up.

But there is no question that we want to make sure we make these investments in Amtrak, and I hope we can ultimately get a bipartisan agreement and have some of the features of bipartisanship we have seen here in the Senate.

We also know that Amtrak, just from a Pennsylvania perspective, is a job creator. It employs over 2,600 Pennsylvanians, and these jobs could be in jeopardy if these cuts are maintained.

The other aspect—and I will end with this on Amtrak—are the suppliers who are affected. And, of course, that is a big jobs issue as well.

Let me move to the second part of my remarks today about this very important appropriations bill, and that has another acronym: CDBG, community development block grants. A lot of people might know this acronym better than THUD—the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development bill.

The Community Development Block Grant Program is so important for a variety of reasons. One of the most important reasons we should focus on it is that it is one of the few remaining Federal programs where the Federal Government says to local governments: Here are some resources. These are taxpayer resources, so you have to safeguard them and spend them wisely, but we are giving you these Federal funds so you can make a decision about what is best for your community.

That is what community development block grants are all about. There is not a one-size-fits-all Federal-Washington-way to spend these dollars.

That is why I cannot understand why some people here want to make the kinds of dangerous cuts to these block grants that some want to make.

We know the Senate bill includes a little more than \$3.15 billion for these block grants—less than the 2013 bill, but it is \$352 million more than the President asked for this year—“this year” meaning 2014. According to calculations by HUD, the funding level provided in the Senate bill will support an estimated 80,900 jobs—twice the level in the House bill—80,900 jobs. That is a good reason to support the Senate bill. That is not the only reason standing alone, but that is a big jobs number. The House bill contains the lowest amount ever provided to the program.

I wish we could stand and say: You know what, communities across the country do not need block grants. They do not need to even decide what is best for the community because all of the problems are taken care of. Everything is wonderful. All of those communities are in perfect shape, so let's just have a big cut to the program.

That would be an interesting scenario if it were true. The reality is that in a lot of communities they have had to deal with the ravages of a foreclosure crisis where the greatest number of Americans ever probably lost their homes—maybe the highest number since the 1930s, No. 1. No. 2, they had to deal with the jobs crisis in addition to the foreclosure crisis. Of course the two are closely related. We just went below half a million people out of work in Pennsylvania, but we are still at about 490,000 people out of work.

So these communities that have had to deal with several avalanches of problems—foreclosure crisis, jobs crisis, and then all of the results of both of these, all of the trauma that has been heaped on these communities, now we are told by some in Washington: Your problems are solved. You do not need any grant funding from the Federal Government to help you decide what is best for your community, whether you are going to use it for foreclosure mitigation or whether you are going to use it for job creation, whether you are going to use that limited resource from the Federal Government to bring a company into your town.

You are being told that, in essence, by implication, you do not need that. That is really an insult to local communities across the country.

We know that the block grant program began in 1975. In its first year it was funded at a \$2.47 billion number. Why do I give that specific number from the 1970s? Well, up until now that is the lowest amount it has ever received but still \$837 million more than the level provided by the House bill. So what the House is doing here is setting records they should not want to set to be in a race to see who can in a more devastating fashion almost decapitate the block grant program.

Since the program started, the number of grantees has doubled, making

the impact of the cuts even greater on communities. These community development block grants allow 47 Pennsylvania communities to address local needs. They get to decide, not the Federal Government. They get the resources, and they decide at the local level. We know that countless communities have received these funds.

These funds have also been made available to State governments. Municipalities depend on this funding for economic development projects, which I mentioned before. To give you some examples of individual cities, the city of Philadelphia, which has had an unemployment rate at 10 percent or above for as long as anyone can remember—we are into several years now where the unemployment rate has been 10 or higher, meaning that between 60,000 and 70,000 or more people have been out of work in that city. CDBG funding in Philadelphia was used to stem the foreclosure crisis, helping nearly 4,000 homeowners avoid foreclosure through housing counseling, funded by the Community Development Block Grant Program. Prior to the funding cuts, these grants provided annually enough resources that 2,818 jobs were created. Now, in a city that has had 60,000 to 70,000 people out of work consistently for several years, 2,818 jobs is a lot of jobs. Philadelphia is a big city, but that is still a lot of jobs that are directly a result of community development block grant funding.

That is why you hear from mayors that are Democrats and Republicans and Independents. Whatever their party, they all seem to come together on these block grant funds because they know they are better judges of what is best for their communities.

The City of Philadelphia developed its own foreclosure mitigation program. They developed the program. They came up with the idea, implemented it, and then used Federal money to support it. Yet you have some people in Washington saying: Do not worry about it. You do not need those funds. We are going to decide what the priorities in your town are.

That is really what they are saying. They may not want to hear this, but that is what you are saying when you tell someone: We are going to drastically cut funding for a successful grant program that has funded projects that you have decided are important or that you may have even created, in the case of this foreclosure mitigation program.

In essence, what they are saying is not just that we are going—that the House or the Senate or any part of our government is going to cut this program dramatically. They are making the decision for those local communities. So all of those folks in Washington who talk about local decision-making and then gut the program have their credibility dramatically undermined.

I will give a few more examples before I wrap up. The City of Pittsburgh

directed some of its grant dollars to promote home ownership and affordable housing. That is our second largest city using these grant funds in a way that was most important to them. The Lehigh Valley, which is the eastern seaboard of our State, just north of Philadelphia—cities such as Allentown, Bethlehem, Easton, those communities—used the funds to encourage private sector investment. So they made a decision in their communities that we are not going to use these funds for foreclosure mitigation or housing, we are going to focus on job creation. We are going to focus on getting private sector businesses to locate in the Lehigh Valley in Pennsylvania. They made that decision, not us. They made that decision. Some people in the House think they should substitute their judgment for the people of the Lehigh Valley in Pennsylvania. I think that is a mistake.

In Lancaster and York Counties down in the southern border of our State, a portion of these grant funds was used to reduce blight and revitalize historic downtowns. Again, they made that decision. They have used these dollars for that.

None of those communities are saying these dollars should not be safeguarded, should not be spent and treated as precious taxpayer dollar resources. No one is saying they should not be scrutinized. No one is saying they should not be audited. No one is saying they should not be carefully examined as to how they spend those dollars. All they are saying to us is let's keep the community development block grant at a reasonable level. We are not asking for the Moon, not asking for a doubling of the funding or some great amount of money that the Federal Government cannot afford. But they are saying: Let us decide that. Washington decides a lot of things. That is the way our system works. But on this one they are saying to us: Let us decide, not Washington.

So we know the value of the program. We know that over the past few years these grant funds have been reduced by nearly 25 percent. So just level funding, unfortunately, becomes a significant victory. Further loss of funds will directly harm these communities that rely upon these grant funds to address their most pressing needs. As I mentioned, mayors across the country rely upon these grants for vital services. I have heard directly from mayors in both parties about this. So further cuts to the block grant program will have a detrimental effect on cities and municipalities, some of which are the ones that have suffered the most from the foreclosure crisis, from the economic recession and the job-killing impact of that recession. If they are not digging out, they have just gotten out of the hole. They are not feeling all that secure yet. These grant funds allow them to make these decisions, allow them to make the investments they want to make.

I yield the floor.

## HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

FIRST SERGEANT TRACY L. STAPLEY

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a recently fallen soldier, 1SG Tracy L. Stapley, one of Utah's finest. He left this earth on July 3, 2013, while serving our country at Camp As Sayliyah, Qatar.

First Sergeant Stapley was an Army man, and his family is an Army family. His love for our country showed through his actions. He served in the U.S. Army Reserve for 26 years, and was assigned to the 308th Medical Logistics Company. He also worked full-time for the Army Reserve as a civilian, and his presence among co-workers will be sorely missed. The 308th recently posted a tribute to First Sergeant Stapley online, part of which I would like to read:

First Sergeant was an amazing leader, mentor, and friend. He always placed his soldiers first and had their backs from day one. To many, he was more than just a first sergeant, he was a friend and a confidant. First Sergeant Stapley was the glue that held the unit together. He excelled in all aspects of his life; from the unit's first sergeant, to his civilian employment, to being a husband and father.

Tracy and his dear wife Antionette are the parents of two beautiful children, Trase and Kennedy. Known as the "dance dad," Tracey was an ardent supporter of Kennedy's dancing. He also loved to attend Trase's sporting events. The unmatched pride of a father was frequently seen at many recitals, and on many sidelines. I trust that all Utahns share the pride that I feel, knowing that this fellow Utahn served not only his country, but also his family with honor and love.

It is comforting to me to know that First Sergeant Stapley's love for our country and dedication to excellence lives on through his family. His son Trase is currently a cadet at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, and I am confident that he is representing Utah and the Stapley family well.

First Sergeant Stapley was always helping others, even when help was unsolicited. His son Trase wrote that Tracy was "a man worth praising and a friend worth having; . . . a fun-loving jokester." Trase added:

He loved the family and loved being around us making sure we had everything we ever needed and more. He was the best. We love you Dude, Rest in Peace. Come see us sometime.

It warms my soul to witness the sustaining power of faith, and the love that a son has for his father.

I imagine that First Sergeant Stapley, like many of our service men and women, would deny the claim that he is a hero. To Tracy, and all of our soldiers, I would say that you are among the few heroes left in our modern world. As Americans, we all feel a profound sense of pride and honor when we see a uniformed soldier, and we would be wise to remember our heroes in all that we do, especially in this body. It is true that we honor those

who have gone before by living our lives with excellence today.

I thank 1SG Tracy L. Stapley for his honorable service in defense of the Constitution and our freedom, and I thank all of our men and women who have also given the ultimate sacrifice. I would like to convey my condolences and profound gratitude to his wife Antionette, his daughter Kennedy, his son Trase, and his father John. Our thoughts and prayers are with you, and with your entire family. It is my solemn hope that we, as Senators, will always remember the tremendous sacrifice, laid upon the altar of freedom by our brave soldiers and their families.

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS  
WALTER HERBERT ANDERSON

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, today I rise to honor PFC Walter Herbert Anderson, who has been awarded a posthumous Purple Heart for his service in World War I. He was born in Toquerville, Utah Territory, on February 3, 1895, 1 year before Utah officially became a State. Little did he know that his service would take him around the world and change the rest of his life. PFC Anderson was involved in some of the largest American offensives of the war and served his country with honor. He was part of the famous 91st Division, affectionately referred to as the "Wild West Division."

The division consisted of a group of inexperienced young men from several Western States. Although they were shipped to Europe in the eleventh hour of the war, as all Americans were, they fought in some of the most ferocious operations. Private First Class Anderson, a member of the 346th artillery regiment, was part of three major offensives: the Saint Mihiel Offensive, France; the Meuse-Argonne Offensive, France, and the Ypres-Lys Offensive, Belgium.

During the Meuse-Argonne Offensive in October 1918, Private First Class Anderson was debilitated by a German gas attack. In World War I, due to the limited knowledge regarding the effects of chemical warfare, gassed soldiers were not counted among the wounded in medical records or morning reports. According to the U.S. Army Medical Department's Office of Medical History, 229 soldiers were gassed from the 91st Division during the Meuse-Argonne Offensive. These soldiers were not put in the hospitals because of gas residuals, which were active for days.

The American casualties from mustard gas were carried to portable "gas hospitals." These consisted of temporary shelters or local homes. In all, during the Meuse-Argonne campaign, there were 20,000 chemical warfare casualties, comprising 22 percent of all injuries during the campaign. Within 24 hours of exposure, victims experienced skin irritations, which often turned into large blisters. If eyes were exposed, as Private First Class Anderson's were, resulting symptoms usually

included swelling, pus, and temporary blindness.

U.S. doctors treated Private First Class Anderson in a private home at La-Ferté-Barnard, France, for about 6 weeks. He was not counted among the wounded. His injuries consisted of temporary blindness, sticky eyes, burning and pain, bronchial problems, and nervousness. Such was the sacrifice that Private First Class Anderson, along with many of his brothers-in-arms, made to defeat the despotic regimes of Central Europe.

Private First Class Anderson was released from the Army in April 1919. Upon release, he was told that his eye problems and nervousness would go away. On April 6, 1921, Private First Class Anderson signed an affidavit of disability and honorable discharge, stating that he "was gassed about October 2, 1918, at the Meuse-Argonne, and was treated by U.S. doctors in a private home at La-Ferté-Bernard, France." His eyes had a film over them, and his eyelids were granulated. He was officially diagnosed with trachoma, which was caused by exposure to mustard gas. He lived honorably with this disability for the rest of his life.

Private First Class Anderson left a legacy of service and sacrifice to his posterity. He served as the post commander of the Utah Veterans of Foreign Wars, and two of his sons also served in the U.S. Armed Forces. He was Salt Lake County commissioner from 1937 to 1938 and also served as a clerk for the Utah House of Representatives. At age 57, he lost an eye as a result of a tumor development and subsequent operation. He pushed on with one eye, until in 1955, stricken with cancer, he left this frail existence for a more exalted sphere.

To Walter and his dear wife Lola and to their posterity, on behalf of the U.S. Senate and the people of Utah, I sincerely thank you for your sacrifices, your love of country, and your honorable service. May the life of PFC Walter Herbert Anderson, deserving the honor of being included in The Military Order of the Purple Heart, shine as an example for us and for future generations. It is my prayer that we will always remember the sacrifices of our brave military men and women who have fought and who continue to fight in defense of our Constitution and our liberty.

TRIBUTE TO ALTON "RED"  
FRANKLIN

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, today I wish to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing September 6, 2013, as Coach Alton "Red" Franklin Day in the State of Louisiana. On this date, Coach Franklin's 35 years of leadership and service to the football program at Haynesville High School as head coach



will be honored in a ceremony to rename Haynesville High School Memorial Stadium to Red Franklin-Memorial Stadium.

Coach Franklin's talent and leadership in athletics grew in high school where he lettered each year of his career in football, baseball, and basketball. After receiving a scholarship to play football at the University of Alabama, Coach Franklin transferred to Louisiana College where he met his beloved wife, Beth Langford. Mr. and Mrs. Franklin, who have been together 50 years, are the proud parents of three sons who played football under Coach Franklin's leadership and grandparents of seven grandchildren, all of whom continue to inspire him as a coach, father, and grandfather.

Coach Franklin began his coaching career in Marksville, LA, in 1961. He later became an assistant coach at Haynesville High School. He was then promoted to head coach in 1967, and served in that position for 35 years. During his career as head coach, Coach Franklin accumulated 366 wins, 8 ties, and only 76 losses in a total of 450 games, earning the rank of second place for Louisiana's best all time, all-class, head coaching record. Throughout his tireless professional efforts, Coach Franklin also devoted much of his time to the youth in his community and the State as an educator, leader, and role model.

Coach Franklin's distinguished career includes many awards, honors, and decorations. Among them are State Coach of the Year for 6 years, District Coach of the Year for 23 years, Region Five Coach of the Year for 2 years, and inductions into the Louisiana Sports, Louisiana College, National Federation of State High School Associations, and North Louisiana Chapter of the National Football Foundation Halls of Fame. Coach Franklin's career leaves a legacy of accomplishment, service, and dedication to all those who are a part of Louisiana's strong communities and football tradition.

Coach Franklin has been and continues to be an inspiration to those who have been impacted by his legendary coaching tenure. It is with my greatest sincerity that I ask my colleagues to join me along with Coach Franklin's family in recognizing the hard work, devotion, and many achievements of this incredible leader.

#### TRIBUTE TO FORREST GERARD

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, on the 40th anniversary of the introduction of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act in 1973, I wish to honor a distinguished advocate for Indian Country and one of the key architects of the Act, Forrest J. Gerard, and recognize him for a lifetime committed to public service.

Forrest, a member of the Blackfeet Tribe, was the first American Indian to draft and facilitate the passage of Indian legislation through Congress. Dur-

ing the 1970s, Forrest partnered with Senator Henry "Scoop" Jackson to dramatically change the United States' policy on Indian affairs. Together, they ended the policy of termination and assimilation, and launched the era of self-governance and self-determination, which continues to guide Federal Indian policy today.

Forrest's service began with the U.S. Army Air Corps as a member of a bomber crew in World War II. After flying 35 combat missions over Nazi-occupied Europe, he became the first member of his family to attend college, receiving a bachelor's degree from the University of Montana in 1949.

Over the next two decades, Forrest worked for the State of Montana, the newly formed Indian Health Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs as a legislative liaison officer, and as the Director of the Office for Indian Progress in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. His goal was to enable future generations of Indian leaders to build healthy and educated communities.

Forrest arrived at the U.S. Senate in 1971 to work with Senator Jackson, then chair of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Senator Jackson had become a strong supporter of self-determination, and believed Forrest Gerard, with his significant background with Federal agencies and his understanding of the American Indian experience, would bring an important perspective to the debate. Forrest was able to combine significant issue expertise with his solid relationships with tribes to enact meaningful legislation that would alter the course of Indian affairs.

Forrest's unique skills and relationships played a critical role in producing the landmark Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act. With the leadership of Senator Jackson and Forrest Gerard, this critical bill was signed by President Ford in 1975 and remains the basis for Federal dealings with tribal governments.

Following the success of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, Forrest worked to strengthen tribal governance by helping to pass the Indian Health Care Improvement Act and the Submarginal Lands Act.

As Native American journalist Mark Trahan put it:

Gerard did great work—subtly, without fanfare, and too often without recognition or even thanks. His approach was honesty and directness in dealing with Indian Country, and he never wavered in his loyalty to the Tribes.

Today we recognize Forrest Gerard for his dedication, intelligence, and persistence, which paved the way for the political achievements that transformed the landscape of Indian affairs. Tribes now have greater autonomy in managing their resources, preserving their cultures, and utilizing their land base. And the government-to-government relationship between the United

States and tribes is now a mature relationship.

Forrest Gerard was honored for his work by the National Congress of American Indians. In 1977 President Jimmy Carter appointed him to be the first Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs. Forrest spent the last 30 years advising Indian people on how to effectively participate in developing policy with government leaders and be part of the political process. Forrest truly has devoted his life to empowering tribal communities.

I think we are long overdue in commending Forrest for his pioneering, industrious career as a voice for Indian Country. Today we celebrate his leadership in charting a new path for American Indians—a path that won the support of Congress, tribal governments, and the Nation.

Forrest Gerard is a hero among a new generation of great Indian leaders. And his contributions will be remembered forever.

#### TRAIL END CENTENNIAL

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I wish to celebrate the centennial of the Trail End State Historic Site in Sheridan, WY.

John Benjamin Kendrick is one of Wyoming's most remarkable politicians. As an orphan in Texas, Kendrick faced many challenges growing up. He spent much of his childhood in poverty and eventually took a job trailing cattle as far north as Montana. Finally, near the Bighorn Mountains of northeastern Wyoming, Kendrick found his home.

It was there that John Kendrick and his wife Eula began their family. The couple had two children, Rosa-May and Manville. After years on the family's OW Ranch outside of Sheridan, Kendrick decided to build an estate in town. It took 5 tedious years to complete the dream house. With superb workmanship, inspired decoration, and fine materials, the Kendrick family finally completed the building in 1913 and named their home the Trail End.

Kendrick and his family were only able to spend a short period of time in the house. In 1914, Kendrick was elected Governor of Wyoming. During his term, Governor Kendrick was known for working with the State legislature to establish a State workmen's compensation system and a Statewide public utilities commission. He also championed many important causes, including women's suffrage and support for struggling farmers.

Within 2 years, he was elected to the United States Senate. He was Wyoming's first Senator to be elected by popular vote under the 17th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. During his 17 years in the U.S. Senate, he focused on issues that are still important to Wyoming: Irrigation, land use, and the protection of natural resources. Kendrick served as chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Lands and

Surveys. He was also a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as well as the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Near the end of his third term, Kendrick announced his retirement and his intention to move home to Sheridan and his beloved Trail End. Sadly, at the age of 76 before his retirement commenced, he passed away in Sheridan surrounded by his family.

Today, the Wyoming Department of State Parks and Cultural Resources is preserving Kendrick's heritage through the care of the Trail End State Historic Site, also known as the Kendrick Mansion. Visitors can tour the architectural gem which is completely furnished with the family's original furniture and personal items.

Senator Kendrick was a staunch supporter of protecting Wyoming's history and landmarks, including the beauty of Yellowstone National Park and the Teton Mountain Range. I rise today to ask that we remember another piece of history—the magnificent house that the Kendrick family called home—the Trail End. Built by a self-made leader, visitors will forever be astonished by the beauty that John B. Kendrick brought to Sheridan, WY, and the entire Nation.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### RECOGNIZING THE GREAT PASSION PLAY

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the Great Passion Play which is currently underway for its 46th consecutive year in Eureka Springs, AR.

Since 1968, over 7.6 million people have attended the Great Passion Play. The inspirational play depicting the last week in the life of Jesus Christ is 1 hour and 45 minutes long featuring almost 200 actors, live animals, and special effects on a three-story tall set built into the hillside.

Performances of the play take place the first Friday of May through the last Saturday in October.

This year, two big names in contemporary Christian music are joining together to host an event in the Eureka Springs Auditorium to celebrate "Passion Play Day" on August 8.

Local resident John Michael Talbot, who is recognized as one of Catholic music's most popular artists and the author of 20 books, will be welcoming Michael Card, who himself has recorded over 31 albums and authored or co-authored over 24 books, for a performance to benefit the Great Passion Play.

Mr. Talbot has deep ties to the area having founded his community "The Brothers and Sisters of Charity" and the "Little Portion Hermitage/Monastery" in neighboring Berryville, AR over 30 years ago.

The Great Passion Play is important for the Eureka Springs community, as

well as the State of Arkansas. It directly employs over 200 people in the town and is important for promoting tourism to the local community. I expect many will come out to benefit this worthy cause on August 8 and am grateful for John Michael Talbot's efforts to support the Great Passion Play.●

##### TRIBUTE TO ROBERT W. CHAMBERS, JR.

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and thank a Nevanan who is here in our Nation's Capital this week, Mr. Robert W. Chambers, Jr. Mr. Chambers is an artillery veteran of the United States Army who served in the 196th Infantry Brigade during the Vietnam war. He, along with his brother and father, is visiting from Nevada this week to participate in a reunion of the 196th Infantry Brigade, and I would like to thank and commend him for his service to our country.

The 196th Infantry Brigade was the last combat brigade to depart from Vietnam in June of 1972. More than 1,000 soldiers who served in the 196th were killed in action in Vietnam, and more than 5,000 others were wounded in action. These immeasurable sacrifices made by intrepid American patriots are truly heroic and deserve our highest respect and deepest appreciation.

This week will mark the 60th anniversary of the armistice that ended hostilities in Korea. That conflict is often tragically referred to as America's "Forgotten War." But the lives lost during that conflict, and during every conflict America has waged to defend freedom both at home and abroad, are far from forgotten. May it never be said that any war in which brave Americans like Robert W. Chambers, Jr. served, is "forgotten." Rather, may we remain ever mindful of the immeasurable sacrifices that have been made throughout our history in defense of liberty.

America's veterans represent the very best of our country, and accordingly, they deserve the very best from their country. As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I recognize the duty we owe to our heroes in uniform who gave their all for this great country. I urge my colleagues to join me in thanking Mr. Chambers for his service, as well as the members of the 196th Infantry Brigade, and wish them well on their reunion.●

##### TRIBUTE TO KURK BROKSAS

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, today I wish to acknowledge the valuable contributions that Special Agent Kurk Broksas of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, ATF, has made to the U.S. Senate as a legislative fellow to my colleague, the late Senator Frank R. Lautenberg. Special Agent Broksas came to the Senate on detail from the ATF in January 2012 and served through the con-

clusion of the 112th Congress. Kurk became such a valued member of Senator Lautenberg's staff that he was asked to extend his tenure into the current Congress, and he provided exemplary service until Senator Lautenberg's passing on June 3, 2013.

Special Agent Broksas has had a long career in Federal law enforcement, and his experience, knowledge, and expertise served Senator Lautenberg, the people of New Jersey, and the Nation.

Kurk Broksas began his career as a U.S. Border Patrol Agent, enforcing Federal law against human traffickers and drug smugglers on the United States/Mexico border. Agent Broksas quickly established himself as a leader, becoming a field training agent and ensuring the next generation of agents were highly trained and performed their dangerous duties with honor and vigilance. Agent Broksas ultimately left the border for New York City to conduct criminal investigations as a special agent with the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

A desire to protect our Nation from criminals armed with firearms and explosives brought Kurk to Washington, DC in 2000 to serve as an ATF special agent. His work over the past 13 years with the ATF involved complex criminal investigations into the illegal manufacture, trafficking, and use of firearms by violent criminals. As ATF's representative to the Capital Area Regional Fugitive Task Force, Special Agent Broksas worked diligently with Federal, State and local police to track down and apprehend the worst of the worst. His tireless efforts ensured that murderers, rapists, and gang members did not evade capture, and victims saw justice.

Special Agent Broksas' expertise was of great use during his time as a legislative fellow in the U.S. Senate. During the past year and a half, our Nation has suffered terrible losses at the hands of criminals and the mentally ill in possession of firearms and explosives: 12 killed and 58 injured at a mass shooting at a movie theater in Aurora, CO; 20 children and 6 adults shot and killed at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, CT; 3 people killed and hundreds wounded at the bombings during the Boston Marathon. While our country grieved, Special Agent Broksas set to work here in the Senate, working late nights providing valuable technical expertise and helping craft legislation to prevent future tragedies. His tenacity and drive exemplified what our Nation desires in the men and women that put on the badge and dedicate their lives to serving our Nation and keeping us safe.

Mr. President, Special Agent Broksas has represented the law enforcement agents of the ATF with distinction and honor. I thank Kurk for his tremendous service to Senator Lautenberg, the United States Senate, and to our Nation.●

## TUALATIN, OREGON

• Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, today I wish to celebrate the centennial anniversary of the city of Tualatin, OR.

Since its founding, the city of Tualatin has exhibited continued growth and increasing prosperity. The city began as the small town of Galbreath in 1853, comprising just 23 families. With the construction of the first bridge across the Tualatin River in 1856 and the arrival of the Portland and Willamette Railway Company in 1866, which attracted business from Portland and throughout the Willamette Valley, the town's population and economic importance increased.

Over the 100 years since its incorporation on August 18, 1913, the city of Tualatin grew from a rural suburb to a vibrant urban city that supports 27,000 residents and 20,000 jobs. Located only 12 miles south of Portland and bisected by two major railways, Tualatin hosts new high-tech industries and upscale shopping centers such as Bridgeport Village.

The city's economic success is complemented by city officials' impressive leadership on environmentally aware urban development initiatives, enhancing residents' quality of life and providing an example to other Oregon cities of responsible urban planning. The Tualatin Commons, a public/private partnership featuring a three-acre manmade lake, a wide public promenade and plaza, and an interactive fountain provides recreational and entertainment opportunities. With over 200 acres of parks, trails, and natural areas, Tualatin also preserves green spaces for the public to enjoy.

The citizens of Tualatin are engaged and motivated, fostering a close-knit and thriving community. Each year area organizations organize the Crawfish Festival, which attracts an estimated 12,000 people and features local food, crafts, and music. The locally developed Citizen Involvement Organization program encourages residents to further improve life within Tualatin by funding community projects.

Throughout the last 100 years, the leaders and citizens of Tualatin have made invaluable contributions to the Portland metropolitan region and to the State of Oregon as a whole. I offer my sincerest congratulations during this celebration and look forward to many more years of prosperity for Tualatin.●

## ST. FRANCIS MEDICAL CENTER

• Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I recognize St. Francis Medical Center on a special occasion.

This week, St. Francis Medical Center celebrates its 100th anniversary. Founded in Monroe, LA, in 1913 by six Franciscan Sisters fulfilling a call to serve others through Jesus Christ's healing ministry, St. Francis Medical Center has grown from a humble 75-patient-bed facility to a 352-bed commu-

nity hospital and the largest in Northeast Louisiana.

In fulfilling the vision of St. Francis of Assisi that all life is a gift from God, the Sisters of Saint Francis have continued to serve others with compassion and care, without hesitation, to improve health and save lives to those most in need.

The continued dedication of the Sisters, doctors, and staff has led to a superior level of health care in our State and has earned the facility 25 accreditations and awards. In 2012 and 2011, St. Francis Medical Center was honored as a Best Employer for Healthy Lifestyles by the National Business Group on Health's Institute on Innovation. Also, U.S. News and World Report rated St. Francis as one of the best hospitals in Louisiana.

St. Francis Medical Center has been a cornerstone of the medical community of Northeast Louisiana, and it is my honor to recognize their 100th anniversary as they prepare to enter their second century of service.●

## MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:03 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2668. An act to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate, to delay the application of the employer health insurance mandate, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 4(b) of the World War I Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 112-272), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Minority Leader appoints the following individual on the part of the House of Representatives to the World War I Centennial Commission: Mr. Robert Dalessandro of Alexandria, Virginia.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Chairman and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Chairman and Mr. DUFFY of Wisconsin.

At 2:23 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 697. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in Clark Coun-

ty, Nevada, for the environmental remediation and reclamation of the Three Kids Mine Project Site, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1542. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish weapons of mass destruction intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2353. An act to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to the operation of vehicles on certain Wisconsin highways, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

At 3:56 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1411. An act to include the Point Arena-Stornetta Public Lands in the California Coastal National Monument as a part of the National Landscape Conservation System, and for other purposes.

## MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 697. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in Clark County, Nevada, for the environmental remediation and reclamation of the Three Kids Mine Project Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1411. An act to include the Point Arena-Stornetta Public Lands in the California Coastal National Monument as a part of the National Landscape Conservation System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1542. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish weapons of mass destruction intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2353. An act to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to the operation of vehicles on certain Wisconsin highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

## MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 2668. An act to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate, to delay the application of the employer health insurance mandate, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER  
COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2334. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Financial Report for fiscal year 2012 for the Prescription Drug User Fee Act (PDUFA); to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2335. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Financial Report for fiscal year 2012 for the Medical Device User Fee Act (MDUFA); to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2336. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on Head Start Monitoring for Fiscal Year 2010"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2337. A communication from the Acting Chief Policy Officer, Legislative and Regulatory Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Parts 4022 and 4044) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2338. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act" (RIN1210-AB44) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2339. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Indirect Food Additives: Adhesives and Components of Coatings" (Docket No. FDA-2012-F-0728) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2340. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act" (RIN0938-AR42) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2341. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act" (RIN1545-BJ60) (TD 9624) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2342. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled

"Strategic Integrated Management Plan for the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER), the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER), and the Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH); to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2343. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to obligations and unobligated balances of funds provided for Federal-aid highway and safety construction programs for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2344. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Annual Report of the Maritime Administration (MARAD) for fiscal years 2010-2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2345. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the activities of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization for 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2346. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle, and Nonroad Technical Amendments" (RIN2127-AL31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2347. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Alcohol and Controlled Substances Testing" (RIN2132-AB09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2348. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Roaring Springs, Texas)" (MB Docket No. 12-236, RM-11671) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2349. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Dove Creek, Colorado)" (MB Docket No. 12-352, RM-11686) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2350. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Matagorda, Texas)" (MB Docket No. 13-52, RM-11693) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2351. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Closed Captioning of Internet Protocol-Delivered Video Programming: Implementation of the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010" (MB Docket

No. 11-154, FCC 13-84) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2352. A communication from the Deputy Chief of the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Structure and Practices of the Video Relay Service Program; Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities" (FCC 13-82) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2353. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Marine Vapor Control Systems" ((RIN1625-AB37) (Docket No. USCG-1999-5150)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2354. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Summit, Mississippi)" (MB Docket No. 12-84, RM-11627) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 3, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2355. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulations and Safety Zones; Marine Events in Captain of the Port Long Island Zone" ((RIN1625-AA00; AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0447)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2356. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Part 95 Instrument Flight Rules; Amdt. No. 507" (RIN2120-AA63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2357. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (144); Amdt. No. 3538" (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2358. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (94); Amdt. No. 3537" (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2359. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turbomeca Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0024)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2360. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1162) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2361. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1001) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2362. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0426) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2363. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Bass Harbor, ME" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2012-0793) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2364. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Gillette, WY" (RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0185) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2365. A communication from the Inspector General of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, notification that the audit of the financial statements of the Federal Trade Commission for fiscal year 2013 has commenced; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2366. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Test Procedures for Residential Furnaces and Boilers" (RIN1904-AC96) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2367. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 13-092, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country regarding any possible effects such a sale might have relating to Israel's Qualitative Military Edge over military threats to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2368. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Canadian Firearms Components Exemptions" (RIN1400-AD07) received in the

Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2369. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior (Indian Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Fiscal Year 2012 Report to Congress Pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 450j-1(c) on the Funding Requirements for Contract Support Costs"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-2370. A joint communication from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the activities and accomplishments of the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense Joint Executive Council for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2371. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medications Prescribed by Non-VA Providers" (RIN2900-AO77) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2013; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2372. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for fiscal year 2014 on the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile, Nuclear Weapons Complex, Nuclear Weapons Delivery Systems and Nuclear Weapons Command and Control System; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2373. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Fiscal Year 2012 Inventory of Contracts for Services"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

\*Daniel Brooks Baer, of Colorado, to be U.S. Representative to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador.

Nominee: Daniel Brooks Baer.

Post Nominated: Permanent Representative to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$1000, 5/2012, Obama for America; \$100, 9/2012, Obama for America.
2. Spouse: (N/A).
3. Children and Spouses: (N/A).
4. Parents: Rebecca Van Buren (widowed): \$25, 7/2012, Obama for America; \$25, 10/2012, Obama for America.
5. Grandparents: Nancy Van Buren: None.
6. Brothers and Spouses: Peter Baer (single), \$10, 9/2012, Obama for America; \$10, 9/2012, Gillibrand for Senate. Lyle Baer (single): None.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Merritt Baer (single), \$25, 8/2012, Hirono for Senate; \$25, 8/2012, Gabbard for Congress; \$25, 8/2012, Mikolisi for Congress; \$25, 8/2012, Pace for Congress; \$100, 9/2012, Obama for America.

\*Douglas Edward Lute, of Indiana, to be United States Permanent Representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Nominee: Douglas Edward Lute.

Post: Chief of Mission—NATO. Nominated: 5/23/2013.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee:

1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: Jane Holl Lute: \$250, 6/28/12, Obama Victory Fund; \$250, 12/31/11, Obama For America; \$250, 11/10/08, DNC Services Fund; \$250, 11/3/08, Obama For America; \$250, 11/3/08, Obama For America; \$250, 11/2/08, Obama Victory Fund; \$250, 11/2/08, Obama Victory Fund; \$250, 10/20/08, Obama For America; \$250, 7/7/08, Obama For America; \$500, 2/1/08, Obama For America; \$250, 10/20/12, Soderberg.
3. Children and Spouses: Amy Lute, None; Kamryn Lute, None; Adellyn Polomski, None.
4. Parents: Phyllis Lute, and John Edward Lute (Deceased).
5. Grandparents: N/A.
6. Brothers and Spouses: John Carl Lute (Deceased).
7. Sisters and Spouses: Patricia Lute and Charles Smith, None; Rebecca Lute, None; Beth and Jack Lyness, None.

\*Victoria Nuland, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (European and Eurasian Affairs).

\*Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

\*Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations.

\*Catherine M. Russell, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador at Large for Global Women's Issues.

\*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. REED, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1337. A bill to promote the tracing of firearms used in crimes, and for other purposes, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COBURN:

S. 1338. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that the Office of

Personnel Management submit an annual report to Congress relating to the use of official time by Federal employees; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 1339. A bill to reauthorize the Ohio & Erie Canal National Heritage Canalway; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1340. A bill to improve passenger vessel security and safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1341. A bill to modify the Forest Service Recreation Residence Program as the program applies to units of the National Forest System derived from the public domain by implementing a simple, equitable, and predictable procedure for determining cabin user fees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 1342. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit expensing of certain depreciable business assets for small businesses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. 1343. A bill to protect the information of livestock producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BEGICH:

S. 1344. A bill to promote research, monitoring, and observation of the Arctic and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1345. A bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Dr. R. Adams Cowley, in recognition of his lifelong commitment to the advancement of trauma care; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1346. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the alternative tax liability limitation for small property and casualty insurance companies; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. CHIESA, Mr. ENZI, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1347. A bill to provide transparency, accountability, and limitations of Government sponsored conferences; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 1348. A bill to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 101

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 101, a bill to prohibit the provision of Federal funds to State and local governments for payment of obligations, to prohibit the Board of Gov-

ernors of the Federal Reserve System from financially assisting State and local governments, and for other purposes.

S. 119

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 119, a bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

S. 231

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 231, a bill to reauthorize the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp.

S. 234

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 234, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 308

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 308, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, to provide for cash relief for years for which annual COLAs do not take effect under certain cash benefit programs, and to provide for Social Security benefit protection.

S. 316

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 316, a bill to recalculate and restore retirement annuity obligations of the United States Postal Service, to eliminate the requirement that the United States Postal Service prefund the Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits Fund, to place restrictions on the closure of postal facilities, to create incentives for innovation for the United States Postal Service, to maintain levels of postal service, and for other purposes.

S. 338

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 338, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the land and water conservation fund to maximize the effectiveness of

the fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 403

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 403, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 420

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 420, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the logical flow of return information between partnerships, corporations, trusts, estates, and individuals to better enable each party to submit timely, accurate returns and reduce the need for extended and amended returns, to provide for modified due dates by regulation, and to conform the automatic corporate extension period to long-standing regulatory rule.

S. 462

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 462, a bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 489

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) were added as cosponsors of S. 489, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase and adjust for inflation the maximum value of articles that may be imported duty-free by one person on one day, and for other purposes.

S. 541

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 541, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 553

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 553, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an exclusion for assistance provided to participants in certain veterinary student loan repayment or forgiveness programs.

S. 557

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 557, a bill to amend title XVIII of



the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 559

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 559, a bill to establish a fund to make payments to the Americans held hostage in Iran, and to members of their families, who are identified as members of the proposed class in case number 1:08-CV-00487 (EGS) of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 567

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 567, a bill to improve the retirement of American families by strengthening Social Security.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 569, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 582

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 582, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

S. 629

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 629, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of the Armed Forces of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law, and for other purposes.

S. 686

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 686, a bill to extend the right of appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board to certain employees of the United States Postal Service.

S. 723

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 723, a bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to revise the medical and evaluation criteria for determining disability in a person diagnosed with Huntington's Disease and to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's Disease.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from Connecticut

(Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 826

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 826, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform and enforce taxation of tobacco products.

S. 836

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 836, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to strengthen the earned income tax credit and make permanent certain tax provisions under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

S. 912

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 912, a bill to allow multi-channel video programming distributors to provide video programming to subscribers on an a la carte basis, and for other purposes.

S. 929

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 929, a bill to impose sanctions on individuals who are complicit in human rights abuses committed against nationals of Vietnam or their family members, and for other purposes.

S. 945

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 945, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes self-management training by authorizing certified diabetes educators to provide diabetes self-management training services, including as part of telehealth services, under part B of the Medicare program.

S. 971

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 971, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exempt the conduct of silvicultural activities from national pollutant discharge elimination system permitting requirements.

S. 1012

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1012, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve operations of recovery auditors under the Medicare integrity program, to increase transparency and accuracy in

audits conducted by contractors, and for other purposes.

S. 1044

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1044, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to install in the area of the World War II Memorial in the District of Columbia a suitable plaque or an inscription with the words that President Franklin D. Roosevelt prayed with the United States on D-Day, June 6, 1944.

S. 1068

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1068, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

S. 1072

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1072, a bill to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes.

S. 1091

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1091, a bill to provide for the issuance of an Alzheimer's Disease Research Semipostal Stamp.

S. 1128

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1128, a bill to clarify the orphan drug exception to the annual fee on branded prescription pharmaceutical manufacturers and importers.

S. 1188

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1188, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the individual mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1204

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1204, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1235

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1235, a bill to restrict any State or

local jurisdiction from imposing a new discriminatory tax on cell phone services, providers, or property.

S. 1251

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1251, a bill to establish programs with respect to childhood, adolescent, and young adult cancer.

S. 1271

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1271, a bill to direct the President to establish guidelines for the United States foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1279

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1279, a bill to prohibit the revocation or withholding of Federal funds to programs whose participants carry out voluntary religious activities.

S. 1282

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1282, a bill to reduce risks to the financial system by limiting banks' ability to engage in certain risky activities and limiting conflicts of interest, to reinstate certain Glass-Steagall Act protections that were repealed by the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1292

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNIS) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1292, a bill to prohibit the funding of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1296

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1296, a bill to amend the Wounded Warrior Act to establish a specific timeline for the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to achieve interoperable electronic health records, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for cooperative and small employer charity pension plans.

S. 1320

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1320, a bill to establish a tiered hiring preference for members of the

reserve components of the armed forces.

S. 1334

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1334, a bill to establish student loan interest rates, and for other purposes.

S. 1335

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1335, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

S. J. RES. 19

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

S. CON. RES. 13

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 13, a concurrent resolution commending the Boys & Girls Clubs of America for its role in improving outcomes for millions of young people and thousands of communities.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 75, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 198

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 198, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Government of the Russian Federation should turn over Edward Snowden to United States authorities, and for other purposes.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. REED, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1337. A bill to promote the tracing of firearms used in crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1337

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Crime Gun Tracing Act of 2013".

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITION.

Section 1709 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd-8) is amended by—

(1) redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as paragraphs (2) through (5), respectively; and

(2) inserting before paragraph (2), as redesignated, the following:

"(1) 'Bureau' means the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives."

#### SEC. 3. INCENTIVES FOR TRACING FIREARMS USED IN CRIMES.

Section 1701 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd) is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

"(c) PREFERENTIAL CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR CERTAIN GRANTS.—In awarding grants under this part, the Attorney General, where feasible—

"(1) may give preferential consideration to an application for hiring and rehiring additional career law enforcement officers that involves a non-Federal contribution exceeding the 25 percent minimum under subsection (g); and

"(2) shall give preferential consideration to an application submitted by an applicant that has reported all firearms recovered during the previous 12 months by the applicant at a crime scene or during the course of a criminal investigation to the Bureau for the purpose of tracing, or to a State agency that reports such firearms to the Bureau for the purpose of tracing."

#### SEC. 4. REPORTING OF FIREARM TRACING BY APPLICANTS FOR COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES GRANTS.

Section 1702(c) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd-1(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (10), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (11), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(12) specify—

"(A) whether the applicant recovered any firearms at a crime scene or during the course of a criminal investigation during the 12 months before the submission of the application;

"(B) the number of firearms described in subparagraph (A);

"(C) the number of firearms described in subparagraph (A) that were reported to the Bureau for tracing, or to a State agency that reports such firearms to the Bureau for tracing; and

"(D) the reason why any firearms described under subparagraph (A) were not reported to the Bureau for tracing, or to a State agency that reports such firearms to the Bureau for tracing."

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. 1343. A bill to protect the information of livestock producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator DONNELLY in introducing legislation that will prevent the EPA from distributing the personal information of farmers. This legislation comes in direct response to

the EPA releasing personal information on over 80,000 farmers nationwide and over 9,000 farmers in Iowa. After the initial data release, I wrote a letter that was signed by 23 of my colleagues to the EPA asking them to explain their rationale for releasing the addresses, emails and phone numbers of so many producers. Their response was unsatisfactory to me so I am introducing this bill to stop the EPA from doing this again.

The EPA's interpretation of the information which can be provided under a Freedom of Information Act, FOIA, request is simply too broad. Our Nation's farmers operate unique businesses in that their homes are often at the same location as their farming operation. When the EPA released this data, activist groups attained contact information and addresses for farm families whose way of life they oppose. This is unacceptable.

I would also like to point out that this bill does not prevent the EPA from collecting the information about where farmers' operations are located. It also does not prevent EPA from disclosing information in the aggregate. The legislation simply prevents them from releasing personal information to the public. Furthermore, I am pleased to have support for this bill from 16 agriculture groups who agree that we should not enable activist groups with personal information. If we want people to trust our government, agencies like the EPA must quit taking actions that shake the confidence of our citizens. I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this commonsense bill.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1739. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1740. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1741. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1742. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1743. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1744. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra.

SA 1745. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1911, of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the

Federal level, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1746. Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1747. Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1748. Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1749. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1750. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1751. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1752. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1753. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1754. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1755. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1756. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1757. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1758. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1759. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1739. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, insert the following:  
SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. (a) Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On June 30, 2012, Mohamed Morsi was elected President of Egypt in elections that were certified as free and fair by the Egyptian Presidential Election Commission and the United Nations.

(2) On July 3, 2013, the military of Egypt removed the democratically elected Presi-

dent of Egypt, arrested his supporters, and suspended the Constitution of Egypt. These actions fit the definition of a military coup d'état.

(3) Pursuant to section 7008 of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Act, 2012 (division I of Public Law 112-74; 125 Stat. 1195), the United States is legally prohibited from providing foreign assistance to any country whose duly elected head of government is deposed by a military coup d'état, or removed in such a way that the military plays a decisive role.

(4) The United States has suspended aid to countries that have undergone military coups d'état in the past, including the Ivory Coast, the Central African Republic, Thailand, Mali, Fiji, and Honduras.

(b)(1) In accordance with section 7008 of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Act, 2012 (division I of Public Law 112-74; 125 Stat. 1195), the United States Government, including the Department of State, shall refrain from providing to the Government of Egypt the assistance restricted under such section.

(2) In addition to the restrictions referred to in paragraph (1), the following restrictions shall be in effect with respect to United States assistance to the Government of Egypt:

(A) Deliveries of defense articles currently slated for transfer to Egyptian Ministry of Defense (MOD) and Ministry of Interior (MOI) shall be suspended until the President certifies to Congress that democratic national elections have taken place in Egypt followed by a peaceful transfer of power.

(B) Provision of defense services to Egyptian MOD and MOI shall be halted immediately until the President certifies to Congress that democratic national elections have taken place in Egypt followed by a peaceful transfer of power.

(C) Processing of draft Letters of Offer and Acceptance (LOAs) for future arms sales to Egyptian MOD and MOI entities shall be halted until the President certifies to Congress that democratic national elections have taken place in Egypt followed by a peaceful transfer of power.

(D) All costs associated with the delays in deliveries and provision of services required under subparagraphs (A) through (C) shall be borne by the Government of Egypt.

(c) Any amounts retained by the United States as a result of implementing subsection (b) shall be made available to the Secretary of Transportation to carry out activities under the heading "BRIDGES IN CRITICAL CORRIDORS".

SA 1740. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available under this Act (or an amendment made by this Act) may be used to administer or enforce the wage-rate requirements of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of part A of subtitle II of title 40, United States Code (commonly referred to as the "Davis-Bacon Act") with respect to any project or program funded under this Act (or amendment).

SA 1741. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 74, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

**SEC. 192. EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION SAFETY FUND.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Emergency Transportation Safety Fund Act”.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT AND FUNDING.**—

(1) **MODIFICATION AND PERMANENT EXTENSION OF THE INCENTIVES TO REINVEST FOREIGN EARNINGS IN THE UNITED STATES.**—

(A) **REPATRIATION SUBJECT TO 5 PERCENT TAX RATE.**—Subsection (a)(1) of section 965 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “85 percent” and inserting “85.7 percent”.

(B) **PERMANENT EXTENSION TO ELECT REPATRIATION.**—Subsection (f) of section 965 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(f) **ELECTION.**—The taxpayer may elect to apply this section to any taxable year only if made on or before the due date (including extensions) for filing the return of tax for such taxable year.”.

(2) **REPATRIATION INCLUDES CURRENT AND ACCUMULATED FOREIGN EARNINGS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (1) of section 965(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amount of dividends taken into account under subsection (a) shall not exceed the sum of the current and accumulated earnings and profits described in section 959(c)(3) for the year a deduction is claimed under subsection (a), without diminution by reason of any distributions made during the election year, for all controlled foreign corporations of the United States shareholder.”.

(B) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(i) Section 965(b) of such Code is amended by striking paragraphs (2) and (4) and by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(ii) Section 965(c) of such Code is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively.

(iii) Paragraph (3) of section 965(c) of such Code, as redesignated by subparagraph (B), is amended to read as follows:

“(3) **CONTROLLED GROUPS.**—All United States shareholders which are members of an affiliated group filing a consolidated return under section 1501 shall be treated as one United States shareholder.”.

(3) **CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**—

(A) The heading for section 965 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “**TEMPORARY**”.

(B) The table of sections for subpart F of part III of subchapter N of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking “Temporary dividends” and inserting “Dividends”.

(4) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **ESTABLISHMENT OF EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION SAFETY FUND.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund, which shall be known as the “Emergency Transportation Safety Fund”.

(2) **TRANSFERS TO EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION SAFETY FUND.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—There are hereby appropriated to the Emergency Transportation

Safety Fund amounts equivalent to 50 percent of the excess of—

(i) the taxes received in the United States Treasury which are attributable to eligible 965 dividends received by corporations which are United States shareholders, over

(ii) the amount of the foreign tax credit allowed under section 901 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which is attributable to the non-deductible portion of such eligible 965 dividends.

(B) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this paragraph—

(i) **ELIGIBLE 965 DIVIDEND.**—The term “eligible 965 dividend” means any amount received from a controlled foreign corporation for which a deduction is allowed under section 965 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as determined based on estimates made by the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Secretary’s delegate.

(ii) **NON-DEDUCTIBLE PORTION.**—The term “non-deductible portion” means the excess of the amount of any eligible 965 dividend over the deductible portion (as defined in section 965(d)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) of such amount.

(3) **EMERGENCY RELIEF EXPENDITURES.**—Section 125(c) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION SAFETY FUND.**—Amounts deposited into the Emergency Transportation Safety Fund established under section 192(c)(1) of the Emergency Transportation Safety Fund Act are authorized to be obligated to carry out, in priority order, the projects on the current list compiled by the Secretary under section 192(d)(1) of such Act that meet the eligibility requirements set forth in subsection (a).”.

(d) **EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES.**—

(1) **LIST.**—The Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with a representative sample of State and local government transportation officials, shall compile a prioritized list of emergency transportation projects, which will guide the allocation of funding to the States from the Emergency Transportation Safety Fund.

(2) **CRITERIA.**—In compiling the list under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Transportation, in addition to other criteria established by the Secretary, shall rank priorities in descending order, beginning with—

(A) whether the project is part of the interstate highway system;

(B) whether the project is a road or bridge that is closed for safety reasons;

(C) the impact of the project on interstate commerce;

(D) the volume of traffic affected by the project; and

(E) the overall value of the project or entity.

(3) **REPORT.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit a report to Congress that includes—

(A) a prioritized list of emergency transportation projects to be funded through the Emergency Transportation Safety Fund; and

(B) a description of the criteria used to establish the list referred to in subparagraph (A).

(4) **QUARTERLY UPDATES.**—Not less frequently than 4 times per year, the Secretary of Transportation shall—

(A) update the report submitted pursuant to paragraph (3);

(B) send a copy of the report to Congress; and

(C) make a copy of the report available to the public through the Department of Transportation’s website.

**SA 1742.** Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 38, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

**SEC. 1.** (a) None of the funds made available under this Act shall be used to carry out the transportation alternatives program under section 213 of title 23, United States Code.

(b) Amounts that would have been made available to carry out the transportation alternatives program described in subsection (a) shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out activities under the heading “BRIDGES IN CRITICAL CORRIDORS”.

**SA 1743.** Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. . REINS ACT.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013” or the “REINS Act”.

(b) **FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.**—

(1) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(A) Section 1 of article I of the United States Constitution grants all legislative powers to Congress.

(B) Over time, Congress has excessively delegated its constitutional charge while failing to conduct appropriate oversight and retain accountability for the content of the laws it passes.

(C) By requiring a vote in Congress, the REINS Act will result in more carefully drafted and detailed legislation, an improved regulatory process, and a legislative branch that is truly accountable to the people of the United States for the laws imposed upon them.

(2) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this section is to increase accountability for and transparency in the Federal regulatory process.

(c) **CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING.**—Chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

**“CHAPTER 8—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING**

**“Sec.**

“801. Congressional review.

“802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules.

“803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules.

“804. Definitions.

“805. Judicial review.

“806. Exemption for monetary policy.

“807. Effective date of certain rules.

**“§ 801. Congressional review**

“(a)(1)(A) Before a rule may take effect, the Federal agency promulgating such rule shall submit to each House of Congress and to the Comptroller General a report containing—

“(i) a copy of the rule;

“(ii) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

“(iii) a classification of the rule as a major or nonmajor rule, including an explanation

of the classification specifically addressing each criteria for a major rule contained within sections 804(2)(A), 804(2)(B), and 804(2)(C);

“(iv) a list of any other related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and

“(v) the proposed effective date of the rule.

“(B) On the date of the submission of the report under subparagraph (A), the Federal agency promulgating the rule shall submit to the Comptroller General and make available to each House of Congress—

“(i) a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any;

“(ii) the actions of the agency pursuant to sections 603, 604, 605, 607, and 609 of title 5, United States Code;

“(iii) the actions of the agency pursuant to sections 1532, 1533, 1534, and 1535 of title 2, United States Code; and

“(iv) any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive orders.

“(C) Upon receipt of a report submitted under subparagraph (A), each House shall provide copies of the report to the chairman and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a bill to amend the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

“(2)(A) The Comptroller General shall provide a report on each major rule to the committees of jurisdiction by the end of 15 calendar days after the submission or publication date as provided in section 802(b)(2). The report of the Comptroller General shall include an assessment of compliance by the agency with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B).

“(B) Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Comptroller General by providing information relevant to the Comptroller General’s report under subparagraph (A).

“(3) A major rule relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1) shall take effect upon enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802 or as provided for in the rule following enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802, whichever is later.

“(4) A nonmajor rule shall take effect as provided by section 803 after submission to Congress under paragraph (1).

“(5) If a joint resolution of approval relating to a major rule is not enacted within the period provided in subsection (b)(2), then a joint resolution of approval relating to the same rule may not be considered under this chapter in the same Congress by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

“(b)(1) A major rule shall not take effect unless the Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval described under section 802.

“(2) If a joint resolution described in subsection (a) is not enacted into law by the end of 70 session days or legislative days, as applicable, beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), then the rule described in that resolution shall be deemed not to be approved and such rule shall not take effect.

“(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (except subject to paragraph (3)), a major rule may take effect for one 90-calendar-day period if the President makes a determination under paragraph (2) and submits written notice of such determination to the Congress.

“(2) Paragraph (1) applies to a determination made by the President by Executive order that the major rule should take effect because such rule is—

“(A) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency;

“(B) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;

“(C) necessary for national security; or

“(D) issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

“(3) An exercise by the President of the authority under this subsection shall have no effect on the procedures under section 802.

“(d)(1) In addition to the opportunity for review otherwise provided under this chapter, sections 802 and 803 shall apply, in the succeeding session of Congress, to any rule for which a report was submitted in accordance with subsection (a)(1)(A) during the period beginning on the date occurring—

“(A) in the case of the Senate, 60 session days before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session; or

“(B) in the case of the House of Representatives, 60 legislative days before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session.

“(2)(A) In applying sections 802 and 803 for purposes of such additional review, a rule described under paragraph (1) shall be treated as though—

“(i) such rule were published in the Federal Register on—

“(I) in the case of the Senate, the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; or

“(II) in the case of the House of Representatives, the 15th legislative day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; and

“(ii) a report on such rule were submitted to Congress under subsection (a)(1) on such date.

“(B) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the requirement under subsection (a)(1) that a report shall be submitted to Congress before a rule can take effect.

“(3) A rule described under paragraph (1) shall take effect as otherwise provided by law (including other subsections of this section).

#### “§ 802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules

“(a)(1) For purposes of this section, the term ‘joint resolution’ means only a joint resolution addressing a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii) that—

“(A) bears no preamble;

“(B) bears the following title: ‘Approving the rule submitted by \_\_\_\_\_ relating to \_\_\_\_\_.’ (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in);

“(C) includes after its resolving clause only the following: ‘That Congress approves the rule submitted by \_\_\_\_\_ relating to \_\_\_\_\_.’ (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in); and

“(D) is introduced pursuant to paragraph (2).

“(2) After a House of Congress receives a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii), the majority leader of that House (or the designee of the majority leader) shall introduce (by request, if appropriate) a joint resolution described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) in the case of the House of Representatives, within 3 legislative days; and

“(B) in the case of the Senate, within 3 session days.

“(3) A joint resolution described in paragraph (1) shall not be subject to amendment at any stage of proceeding.

“(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred in each House of Congress to the committees having jurisdiction over the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

“(c) In the Senate, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred have not reported it at the end of 15 session days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar. A vote on final passage of the resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the 15th session day after the resolution is reported by the committee or committees to which it was referred, or after such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

“(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee or committees to which a joint resolution is referred have reported, or when a committee or committees are discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

“(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

“(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

“(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

“(e) In the House of Representatives, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred has not reported it to the House at the end of 15 legislative days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar. On the second and fourth Thursdays of each month it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to recognize a Member who favors passage of a joint resolution that has appeared on the calendar for not fewer than 5 legislative days to call up the joint resolution for immediate consideration in the House without intervention of any point of order. When so called up, a joint resolution shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and the previous question shall be considered

as ordered to its passage without intervening motion. It shall not be in order to reconsider the vote on passage. If a vote on final passage of the joint resolution has not been taken by the third Thursday on which the Speaker may recognize a Member under this subsection, such vote shall be taken on that day.

“(f)(1) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘identical joint resolution’ means a joint resolution of the first House that proposes to approve the same major rule as a joint resolution of the second House.

“(2) If the second House receives from the first House a joint resolution, the Chair shall determine whether the joint resolution is an identical joint resolution.

“(3) If the second House receives an identical joint resolution—

“(A) the identical joint resolution shall not be referred to a committee; and

“(B) the procedure in the second House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the first house, except that the vote on final passage shall be on the identical joint resolution.

“(4) This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint resolution received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

“(g) If either House has not taken a vote on final passage of the joint resolution by the last day of the period described in section 801(b)(2), then such vote shall be taken on that day.

“(h) This section and section 803 are enacted by Congress—

“(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution described in subsection (a) and superseding other rules only where explicitly so; and

“(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

#### “§ 803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules

“(a) For purposes of this section, the term ‘joint resolution’ means only a joint resolution introduced in the period beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ‘That Congress disapproves the nonmajor rule submitted by the \_\_\_\_\_ relating to \_\_\_\_\_, and such rule shall have no force or effect.’ (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

“(b)(1) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction.

“(2) For purposes of this section, the term ‘submission or publication date’ means the later of the date on which—

“(A) the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); or

“(B) the nonmajor rule is published in the Federal Register, if so published.

“(c) In the Senate, if the committee to which is referred a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has not reported such joint resolution (or an identical joint resolution) at the end of 15 session days after the date of introduction of the joint resolution, such committee may be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution upon a

petition supported in writing by 30 Members of the Senate, and such joint resolution shall be placed on the calendar.

“(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee to which a joint resolution is referred has reported, or when a committee is discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

“(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

“(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

“(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

“(e) In the Senate the procedure specified in subsection (c) or (d) shall not apply to the consideration of a joint resolution respecting a nonmajor rule—

“(1) after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning with the applicable submission or publication date, or

“(2) if the report under section 801(a)(1)(A) was submitted during the period referred to in section 801(d)(1), after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning on the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes.

“(f) If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply:

“(1) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

“(2) With respect to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) of the House receiving the joint resolution—

“(A) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

“(B) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

#### “§ 804. Definitions

“For purposes of this chapter—

“(1) the term ‘Federal agency’ means any agency as that term is defined in section 551(1);

“(2) the term ‘major rule’ means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Manage-

ment and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

“(A) an annual effect on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more;

“(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or

“(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets;

“(3) the term ‘nonmajor rule’ means any rule that is not a major rule; and

“(4) the term ‘rule’ has the meaning given such term in section 551, except that such term does not include—

“(A) any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing;

“(B) any rule relating to agency management or personnel; or

“(C) any rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties.

#### “§ 805. Judicial review

“(a) No determination, finding, action, or omission under this chapter shall be subject to judicial review.

“(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a court may determine whether a Federal agency has completed the necessary requirements under this chapter for a rule to take effect.

“(c) The enactment of a joint resolution of approval under section 802 shall not—

“(1) be interpreted to serve as a grant or modification of statutory authority by Congress for the promulgation of a rule;

“(2) extinguish or affect any claim, whether substantive or procedural, against any alleged defect in a rule; and

“(3) form part of the record before the court in any judicial proceeding concerning a rule except for purposes of determining whether or not the rule is in effect.

#### “§ 806. Exemption for monetary policy

“Nothing in this chapter shall apply to rules that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

#### “§ 807. Effective date of certain rules

“Notwithstanding section 801—

“(1) any rule that establishes, modifies, opens, closes, or conducts a regulatory program for a commercial, recreational, or subsistence activity related to hunting, fishing, or camping; or

“(2) any rule other than a major rule which an agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefore in the rule issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest,

shall take effect at such time as the Federal agency promulgating the rule determines.”.

(d) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) Any rule subject to the congressional approval procedure set forth in section 802 of chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, affecting budget authority, outlays, or receipts



shall be assumed to be effective unless it is not approved in accordance with such section.”.

**SA 1744.** Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** None of the funds made available under this Act shall be used to provide housing assistance benefits for an individual who is convicted of aggravated sexual abuse under section 2241 of title 18, United States Code, murder under section 1111 of title 18, United States Code, an offense under chapter 110 of title 18, United States Code, or any other Federal or State offense involving sexual assault, as defined in 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a)).

**SA 1745.** Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1911, of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** **INCOME-BASED REPAYMENT AMENDMENTS.**

(a) **LIMITATION ON REPAYMENT AMOUNTS AND REPAYMENT PERIOD.**—Section 493C of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1098e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) 10 percent of the result obtained by calculating, on at least an annual basis, the amount by which—

“(i) the borrower’s, and the borrower’s spouse’s (if applicable), adjusted gross income; exceeds

“(ii) 150 percent of the poverty line applicable to the borrower’s family size as determined under section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)).”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(7), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) for a period of time prescribed by the Secretary, not to exceed 20 years, meets 1 or more of the following requirements—

“(i) has made reduced monthly payments under paragraph (1) or paragraph (6);

“(ii) has made monthly payments of not less than the monthly amount calculated under section 428(b)(9)(A)(i) or 455(d)(1)(A), based on a 10-year repayment period, when the borrower first made the election described in this subsection;

“(iii) has made payments of not less than the payments required under a standard repayment plan under section 428(b)(9)(A)(i) or 455(d)(1)(A) with a repayment period of 10 years;

“(iv) has made payments under an income-contingent repayment plan under section 455(d)(1)(D); or

“(v) has been in deferment due to an economic hardship described in section 435(o);”.

(b) **TAXABILITY OF DISCHARGE OF DEBT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (1) of section 108(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “any student loan if” and all that follows and inserting “any student loan if—

“(A) such discharge was pursuant to a provision of such loan under which all or part of the indebtedness of the individual would be discharged if the individual worked for a certain period of time in certain professions for any of a broad class of employers, or

“(B) such discharge was pursuant to section 493C(b)(7) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (relating to income-based repayment).”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to discharges of loans after December 31, 2013.

**SA 1746.** Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mrs. McCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** **NO COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT IN PAY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no adjustment shall be made under section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31) (relating to cost of living adjustments for Members of Congress) during fiscal year 2014.

**SA 1747.** Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mrs. McCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** **ELIMINATION OF AUTOMATIC PAY ADJUSTMENTS FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (2) of section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31) is repealed.

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 601(a)(1) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking “(a)(1)” and inserting “(a)”;  
(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively; and

(3) by striking “as adjusted by paragraph (2) of this subsection” and inserting “adjusted as provided by law”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on February 1, 2015.

**SA 1748.** Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**HEALTH COVERAGE**

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** Section 1312(d)(3)(D) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18032(d)(3)(D)) is amended—

(1) by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting the following:

“(D) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, CONGRESSIONAL STAFF, AND POLITICAL APPOINTEES IN THE EXCHANGE.—”;

(2) in clause (i) in the matter preceding subclause (I)—

(A) by striking “congressional staff with” and inserting “congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, and political appointees with”; and

(B) by striking “congressional staff shall” and inserting “congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, or political appointee, shall”; and

(3) in clause (ii)—

(A) in subclause (II), by inserting after “Congress,” the following: “of a committee of Congress, and of a leadership office of Congress.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) **POLITICAL APPOINTEE.**—In this subparagraph, the term ‘political appointee’ means any individual who—

“(aa) is employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code, (relating to the Executive Schedule);

“(bb) is a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code; or

“(cc) is employed in a position in the executive branch of the Government of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations.”.

**SA 1749.** Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 26, line 12, after “benefits” insert “and the project will be carried out on a bridge that the Federal Highway Administration has classified as functionally obsolete”.

**SA 1750.** Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 185, lines 9 and 10, strike “or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation” and insert “provide a loan or loan guarantee to, provide an annual salary to, or provide any other federal funding to, any Federal employee, any individual, or any corporation”.

**SA 1751.** Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of

Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.**

None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to pay an employee (as that term is defined in section 7103 of title 5, United States Code) for any period of official time (as that term is used in section 7131 of title 5, United States Code).

**SA 1752.** Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 19, beginning on line 17, strike “, and \$6,000,000,” and all that follows through “Program” on line 21.

**SA 1753.** Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 177, line 15, strike “by striking” and all that follows through “, and” on line 16.

**SA 1754.** Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 104, line 12, strike “*Provided further*” and all that follows through “use of any such funds” on line 18, and insert “*Provided further*, That for all match requirements applicable to funds made available under this heading for this fiscal year and prior years, a grantee may not use as a source of match funds other funds administered by the Secretary and other Federal agencies”.

**SA 1755.** Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 129, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 130, line 17, and renumber sections accordingly.

**SA 1756.** Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act and except as provided in subsection (b), any report required to be submitted by a Federal agency to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under this Act shall be posted on the public website of that agency upon receipt by the committee.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to a report if—

- (1) the public posting of the report compromises national security; or
- (2) the report contains proprietary information.

**SA 1757.** Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall submit to Congress a report on legislative options to modernize and improve targeting of the allocation formulas used for the community development block grant program established under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301et seq.).

**SA 1758.** Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 98, line 7, strike “\$3,150,000,000” and insert “\$2,798,000,000”.

**SA 1759.** Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1243, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 59, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

**SEC. 168.** Section 5307(a)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting “or general public demand response” after “fixed route” each place that term appears.

## NOTICES OF HEARINGS

### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before Subcommittee on National Parks. The hearing will be held on Wednesday, July 31, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the following bills:

S. 398, to establish the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Women’s History Museum, and for other purposes;

S. 524, to amend the National Trails System Act to provide for the study of the Pike National Historic Trail;

S. 618, to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct certain special resource studies;

S. 702, to designate the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor as “The Last Green Valley National Heritage Corridor”;

S. 781, to modify the boundary of Yosemite National Park, and for other purposes;

S. 782, to amend Public Law 101-377 to revise the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Gettysburg Train Station, and for other purposes;

S. 869, to establish the Alabama Black Belt National Heritage Area, and for other purposes;

S. 925, to improve the Lower East Side Tenement National Historic Site, and for other purposes;

S. 995, to authorize the National Desert Storm Memorial Association to establish the National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 974, to provide for certain land conveyances in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes;

S. 1044, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to install in the area of the World War II Memorial in the District of Columbia a suitable plaque or an inscription with the words that President Franklin D. Roosevelt prayed with the United States on D-Day, June 6, 1944;

S. 1071, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make improvements to support facilities for National Historic Sites operated by the National Park Service, and for other purposes;

S. 1138, to reauthorize the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area;

S. 1151, to reauthorize the America’s Agricultural Heritage Partnership in the State of Iowa;

S. 1157, to reauthorize the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area, the Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area, the Delaware and Lehigh National Heritage Corridor, and the Schuylkill River Valley National Heritage Area;

S. 1186, to reauthorize the Essex National Heritage Area;

S. 1252, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Missisquoi River and the Trout River in the State of Vermont, as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System;

S. 1253, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Farmington River and Salmon Brook in the State of Connecticut as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes;

H.R. 674, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating prehistoric, historic,

and limestone forest sites on Rota. Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as a unit of the National Park System;

H.R. 885, to expand the boundary of the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1033 and S. 916, to authorize the acquisition and protection of nationally significant battlefields and associated sites of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812 under the American Battlefield Protection Program, and

H.R. 1158, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain lakes in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 304 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510-6150, or by email to John.Assini@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact please contact David Brooks (202) 224-9863 or John Assini (202) 224-9313.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Rules and Administration will meet on Wednesday, July 24, 2013, at 9:50 a.m., to conduct a business meeting to consider the nomination of Davita Vance-Cooks, of Virginia, to be the public printer, and to consider S. 375, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic format.

For further information regarding this hearing, please contact Lynden Armstrong at the Rules and Administration Committee, (202) 224-6352.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Rules and Administration will meet on Wednesday, July 24, 2013, at 10 a.m. to hear testimony on the nomination of Ann Miller Ravel and Lee E. Goodman to be members of the Federal Election Commission.

For further information regarding this hearing, please contact Jean Bordewich at the Rules and Administration Committee, (202) 224-6352.

### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

#### COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 23, 2013, at 10:30 a.m. in room 328A of the Russell Senate Office building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Re-

sources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate to conduct a hearing on July 23, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-266 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 23, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate office building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Hearing on the Nomination of Kenneth Kopocis to be Assistant Administrator for the Office of Water of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), James Jones to be Assistant Administrator for the Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention of the EPA, and Avi Garbow to be General Counsel for the EPA."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 23, 2013, at 9 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 23, 2013, at 10:15 a.m., to hold a briefing entitled, "Briefing on Nuclear Employment."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 23, 2013, at 2:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, in order to conduct a hearing entitled "Hearing on National Labor Relations Board Nominees" on July 23, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on, July 23, 2013, at 10:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "The 90/10 Rule:

Improving Educational Outcomes for our Military and Veterans."

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 23, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, COMPETITION POLICY AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on July 23, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Pay-for-Delay Deals: Limiting Competition and Costing Consumers."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON BANKRUPTCY AND THE COURTS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and the Courts, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on July 23, 2013, at 3 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Sequestering Justice: How the Budget Crisis is Undermining Our Courts."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 23, 2013, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "Examining Financial Holding Companies: Should Banks Control Power Plants, Warehouses and Oil Refineries?"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES, INSURANCE, AND INVESTMENT

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance and Investment be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 23, 2013, at 3 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "Creating a Housing Finance System Built to Last: Ensuring Access for Community Institutions."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS, ATMOSPHERE, FISHERIES, AND THE COAST GUARD

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and the Coast Guard of the

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to hold a meeting during the session the Senate on July 23, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, "New England and Mid-atlantic Perspectives on Magnuson-Stevens Act Reauthorization."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

MEASURE READ THE FIRST  
TIME—H.R. 2668

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told there is a bill at the desk due for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2668) to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate, to delay the application of the employer health insurance mandate, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I now ask for a second reading in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV but object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

---

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we hope to have a little more business of the day, but we will wait and see.

When we complete our business today, I ask unanimous consent that we adjourn until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, Wednesday, July 24; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour,

with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority the final half; that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of S. 1243, the Transportation appropriations bill; further, that at 3:40 p.m. tomorrow, the Senate observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson, who were U.S. Capitol Policemen killed 15 years ago in the line of duty defending this building, the people who work here, and all the visitors against an armed intruder who killed both of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

UNANIMOUS CONSENT  
AGREEMENT—H.R. 1911

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by me after consultation with Senator MCCONNELL, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 139, H.R. 1911; that the only first-degree amendment in order to the bill be a Manchin-Burr amendment, the text of which is at the desk; that the only second-degree amendments in order to the Manchin-Burr amendment be the following, the text of which is at the desk: Reed of Rhode Island-Warren, and the second amendment would be Sanders; there be up to 1 hour of debate equally divided between the proponents

and opponents on each amendment; that there be 3 hours of debate on the bill equally divided between the chairman and ranking member or their designees, with Senator BOXER controlling 30 minutes of the Democratic time and Senator REED controlling 15 minutes of the Democratic time; that no points of order or motions be in order other than budget points of order and the applicable motions to waive; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the second-degree amendments in the order listed; that upon disposition of the Sanders amendment, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Manchin-Burr amendment, as amended, if amended; that upon disposition of the Manchin-Burr amendment, the bill, as amended, if amended, be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended; that all of the amendments and passage of the bill be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold; that there be two minutes equally divided between the votes; finally, all after the first vote be 10-minute votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, first of all, I would like the RECORD to reflect how instrumental the Presiding Officer was in our ability to get this done. I appreciate it very much, as does everyone in the Senate. In the near future, the American people will acknowledge his good work on this issue.

---

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.  
TOMORROW

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:10 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 24, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.